

PARTICULARISM AND UNIVERSALISM
IN
THE TEACHING OF JESUS

by
Earl H. Parker

A Ph. D. Thesis
in
New Testament Studies
Submitted
to
The University of Edinburgh
January, 1952
(Revised March, 1953)



PREFACE

The study outlined in the following pages arose out of the simple desire of the writer to learn more about the teaching of our Lord. This investigation of Jesus' teaching acquired a more specific purpose on the assignment by the committee on graduate studies at New College of the topic, "Particularism and Universalism in the Teaching of Jesus." The ultimate delineation of the study emerged from the author's definition of the topic.

It is necessary here to record only a word about the nature of this paper. The first chapter delineates the problem, pointing out its emergence in the history of the Church. The second chapter indicates the Old Testament background of the problem. The third chapter shows the bias of the synoptic gospels. The subsequent chapters essay a statement of Jesus' attitude toward Judaism and the Gentiles. The paper purports to be exegetical rather than philosophical. Its outline reveals the conviction of the writer that the teaching of Jesus can be comprehended only against the background of the Old Testament faith, and it shows his confidence in Canon Streeter's four document hypothesis.

Indebtedness to others will be obvious on every page. Yet, special reference must be made to Professors William Manson, J. S. Stewart, and N. W. Porteous, all of New College, whose counsels were both illuminating and inspiring. The writings of Professors C. H. Dodd and T. W. Manson also merit special mention because of their unusual helpfulness.

The paper's deficiencies are of course the writer's own.

CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. The Development of the Gentile Problem	1
II. The Religion of Israel and the Gentile	27
III. The Bias of the Synoptic Gospels: Christianity, an Independent and Universal Faith	54
IV. Judaism and the Gentiles in the Ministry of Jesus: I. The Marcan Source	80
V. Judaism and the Gentiles in the Ministry of Jesus: II. The Q Source	119
VI. Judaism and the Gentiles in the Ministry of Jesus: III. The L Source	143
VII. Judaism and the Gentiles in the Ministry of Jesus: IV. The M Source	161
VIII. Epilogue	174
Bibliography	175

CHAPTER I: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE GENTILE PROBLEM

The most remarkable development of early Christianity was the emergence of its mission to the Gentiles, a development which exercised no inconsiderable influence in preserving it from the extinction suffered by the followers of John the Baptist, the Essenes, and other coteries within A. D. first century Judaism.¹ Nevertheless, the facts behind the development of Gentile Christianity are unfortunately, to a large extent, lost to us. Of the beginnings of Christianity in two of the three cities which in size and influence stood out unique in the Mediterranean world, we have no data. Of the founding of the church at Antioch we can speak with certainty (see below, pp. 17 f.). On the other hand, the church at Rome emerges, its establishment already accomplished, in Paul's epistle to the Romans. Likewise, the beginnings of Alexandrian Christianity are clouded. (For a conjecture as to the time and circumstance of its founding, see below, pp. 18 ff.). Nonetheless, the New Testament records facts sufficient for our comprehension of the

1. It is almost impossible to over-emphasize the significance of the Gentile mission for the preservation of the Christian Gospel. The sectarian Jewish Christian movement was decimated by the destruction of Jerusalem in A. D. 70 (Streeter, The Primitive Church, pp. 40ff.). Its survival was generally unimportant and localized in Palestine and the immediate neighborhood (Burkitt, Christian Beginnings, p. 72). The historical significance of this community is its relationship as a source to Islam. "Such was the end of Jewish Christianity. The enthusiasm of the early days was succeeded by stagnation, decay, and finally dissolution" (Wernle, The Beginnings of Christianity, vol. 1, p. 157).

The one enduring gift of the Judaizers to Christianity is found in canonical literature: e.g. the special source of the Gospel according to St. Matthew and the Epistle of James.

problems attending the establishment of Gentile Christianity.²
To these facts we now turn our attention.

The community which emerged from the Resurrection of Jesus was a fellowship within Judaism. There are several obvious indications of the Jewish character of the first Christian community. 1) Their zeal for and attendance upon the worship of the synagogue and the Temple was steadfast, if not even heightened.³ 2) They maintained their lenient conformity to the requirements of the Law.⁴ 3) The expression of their earliest hope linked the Kingdom of God to Israel.⁵ 4) The polity of the community was marked by Jewish practice -- e.g. the casting of lots in selecting Matthias.⁶ Finally the Jewishness of the primitive Christian Community is reflected by the relative peace which its members enjoyed. Prior to the martyrdom of Stephen there is only a certain amount of police action taken by the high officials of the Temple.⁷ This freedom from persecution was effected in part

2. If our treatment in the following pages may appear to represent the Church as taking a series of systematic logical steps, which may imply the evolution of a changing policy towards the problem of missionary work among the Gentiles, this is not in accord with the intention of the first Christian historian. Luke "recognized of course that the process of conversion proceeded by degrees, but the divine plan was present from the beginning; his real interest is not the evolution of an institution, but the gradual attainment of God's predestined purpose." All conceivable types of converts were present at Pentecost (H. J. Cadbury, The Beginnings of Christianity, vol. 5, pp. 68ff.).

3. According to Mt. 5:23f. they would even have taken part in the sacrifice of the altar.

4. Cf. G. B. Stevens. The Theology of the New Testament, p. 258; J. Weiss, History of Primitive Christianity, vol. 1, p. 168.

5. "Wilt thou restore the kingdom to Israel" (Acts 1:6; cf. Lk. 24:41)

6. Acts 1:23 (considered legendary by Weiss, op. cit., p. 143).

7. No more seems to underlie the arrests of Peter and John in Acts 3 and 5. Cf. T. W. Manson, Ryl. Bul., XXIV, no. 1, p. 63.

through the secretiveness of the early Church.⁸ The features of its life which sharply distinguished it from orthodox Judaism (see below, pp. 4ff.) seem to have transpired at first only within the circle of personal intimacy. "The earliest services of the Christian Church were secret conventicles, meetings in the house of a friend behind closed doors." Note the final chapter of each gospel and Acts 12. It is possible that the missionary work of the apostles was in part secretly carried on. Jesus Himself is represented as saying, "Whatsoever I tell you in darkness ... and that which ye hear in the ear in closets."⁹ And even when the message could no longer be restrained, but by inner necessity found its way to the public (to use the language of the book of Acts -- following Pentecost), the first wave of this missionary movement took place exclusively in Jewish territory.¹⁰

Yet, the Church was not a synagogue without its own unique characteristics. A feature which conclusively separated the Christians from other Jews was their relationship to Jesus. The first Christians believed themselves to be specially inspired by the Spirit of God and entrusted with a divine message, as had

8. The most important factor in Christian freedom from Jewish persecution is that the early Christians preached circumcision as well as the Cross. As long as they did this, orthodox Judaism respected them. Cf. Gal. 5:11, 6:12. Note the high regard of orthodox Jews for James, the brother of our Lord.

9. Mt. 10:27; cf. Lk. 12:3. Matthew has turned a Q warning of Jesus to the Pharisees into the vehicle of a full-blown esoteric doctrine (R. Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, p. 149).

10. For the thought that the message must be released and made public, see Mt. 5:15? Lk. 11:33. Matthew contemplates a reform within Judaism; Luke, conversions from the outside. T.W. Manson observes; "It is noteworthy that even now (Gal. 2:9), at least fifteen years after the Crucifixion, the Jerusalem Apostles do not seem to have an idea beyond Home Mission Work" (op. cit., p. 66, fn. 1).

been the prophets of old and Jesus Himself. The context of this message was that Jesus was the Messiah. Indeed the existence of the first Christian community is inexplicable apart from the conviction that Jesus was the Messiah.¹¹ A group of men who had despaired at the death of their leader were assured by his Resurrection that God had thus vindicated His Messiah.¹² A second witness to the Messiahship of Jesus was found in Old Testament prophecies. Moses had announced His coming.¹³ David had foretold His Resurrection.¹⁴ In passing it might be noted that the prestige of Davidic descent was claimed for Jesus,¹⁵ although He had denied the traditional Davidic expectation.¹⁶

The relationship to Jesus was early expressed by referring to Him as Lord, maran.¹⁷ The Resurrection deepened the relation-

11. Prof. W. Manson opines "This confession stands so near to the beginning of Christian history that beside it no other starting-point is perceptible" (Jesus the Messiah, p. 2).

12. Cf. C. T. Craig, The Beginning of Christianity, pp. 133, 138.

13. Acts 3:22, which cites Deut. 18:15, apparently regarded it as fulfilled in the preaching and teaching of Jesus.

14. Acts 2:24-31, which quotes Psalm 16:10.

15. Acts 2:30-31, citing Ps. 132:11. See Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching, p. 39.

16. Mk. 12:35-37 and parallels. See below, chapter 4, p. .

17. The liturgical expression Marana tha, "Our Lord, come!" (I Cor. 16:22) certainly began in the primitive, Aramaic-speaking Church. The meaning of the word maran must be found in the O. T. word "adonai" which denoted "a God who stood in a special covenant relation with His worshippers" (Dodd, Romans, p. 167). Following in the wake of Bousset, Lohmeyer, and others, Prof. A. M. Hunter has recently demonstrated that the fundamental Christian confession, "Jesus is Lord" (Rom. 10:9), belonged to apostolic Christianity in general -- not a surprising thesis when we recall that Rome was not a Pauline church -- and that Phil. 2:6-11, the so-called kenosis passage, is a pre-Pauline Christian hymn (Paul and His Predecessors, pp. 31 and 46ff.).

ship of the disciples to Jesus. No longer were they merely the companions of their Rabbi.¹⁸ But rather were they the servants of their Lord.¹⁹ By virtue of the Resurrection Jesus had been exalted at the right hand of God as Lord and Christ.²⁰ The prominence which Psalm 110:1²¹ holds in the New Testament²² establishes it as one of the fundamental texts of the primitive kerygma. Indeed there is no adequate reason for rejecting the statement of Mark that this passage was cited by Jesus Himself in His public teaching in the Temple. This being so, there is good reason for affirming that the use of the title "Lord" for Jesus is primitive.²³

Jesus' exaltation (Acts 2:33-36, *passim*) has inaugurated a new age. "This is what was spoken by the prophet Joel."²⁴ Prof. Dodd notes "a standing principle of Rabbinic exegesis of the Old Testament that what the prophets predicted had reference to the 'days of the Messiah,' that is to say, to the expected time when God, after long centuries of waiting should visit His people with

18. ὁ διδάσκαλος at Mk. 14:14 doubtlessly represents Rabban, as the Syriac has it. See Burkitt, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

19. The general avoidance of the title κύριος in the Synoptic Gospels is noteworthy. Burkitt remarks: "That Mark so entirely, and Matthew and Luke to so great an extent, have marked the difference between the conditions in the periods before and after the belief in the resurrection of Jesus as regards this matter of nomenclature is to me a singular indication of historical feeling on the part of the Evangelists, a feeling which is not at all shared by what we know of the writer of the apocryphal evangelical literature" (*op. cit.*, p. 52).

20. Acts 2:33-36; Cf. Lk. 24:34.

21. "Jehovah saith unto my Lord,
Sit thou at my right hand,

Until I make thine enemies thine footstool."

22. Mk. 12:36, Acts 2:34-35, I Cor. 15:25, Heb. 1:13.

23. Cf. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching, p. 24.

24. Acts 2:16; cf. 3:18, 3:24.

judgment and blessing, bringing to a climax His dealings with them in history."²⁵ In the New Age men are assured a share in the future heavenly blessedness by confession of the exalted Christ and by repentance. "In no other is there salvation, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which you must be saved."²⁶

It would follow that the first Christians considered themselves as the Remnant or True Israel.²⁷ This can be stated both in a positive and in a negative form. Positively: they considered themselves to be the Messianic community. As such, they alone understood the prophets aright, and the covenant promises were their peculiar possession.²⁸ Negatively: they considered the Israel which had rejected Jesus as cut off from the "promises of Israel."²⁹ Thus only can the persistent effort and hope to win Israel to Jesus be adequately explained.³⁰ Even as the disciples

25. Op. cit., p. 38. Compare Jesus' references after the Petrine confession to the Kingdom of God as "something into which men may enter" (passages tabulated and discussed by T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, pp. 118f.; cf. p. 25).

26. Acts 4:12; see also 5:31, 2:38-39, 3:19, 25-26; cf. Kundsinn, Form Criticism, p. 99.

27. Canon Streeter in his inimitable way has expressed this thesis with great clarity. "They did not regard themselves as a new society, but as the ancient 'People of God,' that is, as the portion of the Church of the Patriarchs and Prophets which had not, by rejecting the Messiah, forfeited its birthright and cut itself off from the 'promises of Israel.' Many of the prophets had proclaimed that only a remnant of Israel after the flesh would repent and be saved; others had foretold that in the Messianic Age Gentiles too would be brought to share the religious privileges of Israel. The Christian position was that, by recognizing Jesus as Messiah, they and they alone understood the prophets aright" (The Primitive Church, p. 47).

28. Acts 2:39, 3:25-26. Cf. Dodd, op. cit., p. 52, where he says that the "calling" and "election" of the Church as the "Israel of God" is not peculiar to Pauline teaching.

29. Acts 3:19-23.

30. This hope was also keen with Paul (Rom. 11:26).

of Isaiah sought to avert the doom imminent to Jerusalem so the disciples of Jesus sought to win the Jews back into the "promises of Israel."³¹

The Messianic community held that the Messianic Age in which it was living would reach its consummation in the imminent return of Christ.

"Repent therefore,... that he may send the Christ appointed for you, Jesus, whom heaven must receive until the time for establishing all that God spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets from of old" (Acts 3:19-21).

The centrality of this expectation is further revealed in the words of the angels (Acts 1:11) which would at least augment the expectancy of the community aroused by the words of Jesus, "Therefore you also must be ready; for the Son of man is coming at an hour you do not expect."³² The parousia-expectation, which had the effect almost of a prescience,³³ must have had extra-ordinarily deep roots in Christian belief. The appendix to the Fourth Gospel is evidence that so long as one survivor of the generation of the apostles remained, the Church clung to the belief that during his lifetime the Lord would come.³⁴

This belief in Jesus' imminent return limited the proclamation of the Gospel. We have already remarked on the Jewish character of the Kingdom expected by the first Christians. We have also called attention to the impetus which made Christianity a missionary religion and we have noted that the first wave of this missionary movement took place exclusively in Jewish terri-

31. Cf. Wernle, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 121.

32. Mt. 24:44; cf. 10:23.

33. The words of the angels in Acts 1:11, "This Jesus ... shall so come," have a positive, clairvoyant ring to them.

34. Cf. Dodd, op. cit., p. 64.

tory. That the Gospel was treated at first as an article not for export may be attributed to the early conviction that the advent was imminent.³⁵

Yet, events were destined to occur which contributed to the eventual severance of the Christian community from Judaism. These events concern the founding of Gentile Christianity. Hellenistic Jewish-Christians³⁶ played a prominent role in this drama.³⁷

Stephen (ca. A. D. 35) was the first of these individuals. In spite of the author's editing of the event at Acts 6:8ff.³⁸ Stephen emerges a clear historical figure. Full of enthusiasm and energy, Stephen brought the Gospel into the arena of public discussion. In doing so he aroused the opposition of his Hellenistic countrymen. What was it that Stephen did which incited the wrath of his compatriots?

It is essential in interpreting the work of Stephen that we consider not only the charge brought against him but also his speech³⁹ and the results of his work. If we consider only the

35. Cf. Stevens, op. cit., p. 262; A. Loisy, The Birth of the Christian Religion, p. 133.

36. Cadbury has clearly shown the difficulties in translating **Ἑλληνισταί** "Greek-speaking Jews" or "Hellenistic Jews." His conclusion, however, that Hellenistai may be equated with **Ἕλληνες** (see op. cit., pp. 58ff.) seems improbable in the present context due to the later missionary procedure of working at first directly through Jewish synagogues and not simultaneously at a Gentile mission -- a procedure difficult of explanation if the Hellenistai were Greeks.

37. Cf. Loisy, op. cit., p. 114.

38. Luke refers to false witnesses (6:13); but in so far as the speech alludes to the ground of complaint -- and it scarcely does -- it is at least in part "equivalent to a substantial justification of the doctrine complained of" (Weiszäcker, The Apostolic Age, vol. 1, p. 64; cf. Loisy, op. cit., p. 116; Cadbury and Lake, op. cit., vol. 4, p. 69).

39. "The general character of the speech seems to fit in very well with the theory that it represents either a good tradition as to what Stephen really did say, or at least what a very early Christian, not of the Pauline school, would have wished him to say" (Cadbury and Lake, op. cit., p. 70)

accusation (verse 13), the subsequent martyrdom of Stephen, and its concomitant the persecution of the Hellenists, we might conclude that Stephen's work was a doctrinaire assault on Jewish religious practices.⁴⁰ Support for such a conclusion can be found at verse 48 which Cadbury and Lake⁴¹ consider "a practical justification of the accusation that he spoke evil of the Temple." If we look no further, we can say that Stephen bitterly attacked the Jewish religious system, that his action infuriated the Jews who consequently executed him, and that his followers fled to avert the wrath of the Jews which was now vented upon them. But such a conclusion does not attend to all the facts. It ignores to a large extent the speech of Stephen, in which the absence of any attack on the Law of Moses is quite noticeable. "On the contrary, the underlying contention of Stephen seems to be that the Law was the word of God, which ought to be observed, but was not."⁴² Moreover, this conclusion overlooks what is, to my mind, the most important consequence of Stephen's work, namely, the sense of urgency to carry the Gospel to the Gentiles.⁴³

Let us turn to the speech of Stephen. It is an impassioned sketch of the history of Israel from Abraham to Solomon with a sweeping reference to the prophets and an application to the time

40. So Loisy, op. cit., p. 116: "We are entitled to infer ... that this Hellenizing Jew went to the length of saying that the Temple, the bloody sacrifices, the legal observances and whatever was specifically Jewish in the established cult would pass away at the coming of Christ."

41. Op. cit., p. 69.

42. Ibid. See Acts 7:38f., 53 on this point.

43. Loisy has noted that among at least some of those who fled the persecution "the desire to proclaim their message held priority over personal interest" (op. cit., p. 124).

of the speaker.⁴⁴ It is important to observe how the following three notes are recurrently sounded: 1) God's calling out of Israel, 2) the general tendency of Israel to resist the prophetic vision, and 3) God's subsequent punishment of Israel.

1) The speech begins with God's call of Abraham. "Depart from your land and from your kindred and go into the land which I will show you."⁴⁵ It proceeds with the implication that God was leading Joseph into Egypt. "And the patriarchs, jealous of Joseph, sold him into Egypt; but God was with him."⁴⁶ Stephen's speech continues with God's call of Moses. "I have come down to deliver them. And now come, I will send you into Egypt."⁴⁷

2) Running concurrently with this emphasis on God's calling out of Israel is die Invektive gegen die Juden,⁴⁸ Namely the Israelitish tendency to rebel against their divinely appointed leaders and guides. Joseph's brothers were incited with jealousy against him.⁴⁹ The Israelites were disobedient to Moses. "Our fathers refused to obey him, but thrusting him aside, and in their hearts they turned to Egypt, saying to Aaron, 'Make for us gods to go before us;...'"⁵⁰ The indictment against the Jews is summed up

44. Can the absence of any reference to the period of the Exile (faintly alluded to in verse 43) and the period of the Return in which the Law and the Temple ritual crystallized have any bearing on Stephen's supposed antipathy toward the cult?

45. Acts 7:3.

46. Acts 7:9 καὶ ἦν ὁ Θεὸς μετ' αὐτοῦ. The use of the copulative καί here may not be significant. However, the absence of an adversative conjunction is suggestive. The inference is that the selling of Joseph into Egyptian slavery accorded with the purpose of God.

47. Acts 7:34.

48. E. Meyer, Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums, bd. 3, p.161.

49. Acts 7:9.

50. Acts 7:39-40; cf. 7:25.

up in the charge, "You always resist the Holy Spirit."⁵¹ Jewish resistance against the spirit of prophecy has been continuously revealed in their maltreatment of the prophets; its most recent expression was the betrayal and murder of the Righteous One.⁵²

3) Stephen cites two cases in which the Israelitish rebellion against its divinely appointed leaders was followed by a temporary abandonment of them by God. a) Following the Patriarchs' act of jealousy against Joseph was the enslavement of the Israelites in Egypt.⁵³ b) The rebellion against Moses' leadership entailed the abandonment of Israel to the worship of the "host of heaven."⁵⁴

Not a great deal more can be said about the content of the speech. There remains, however, an implication to note. As God called out Israel through Abraham, Joseph, and Moses, He again has called them to go out under the leadership of Jesus. There is no explicit statement to this effect. However, there is the Mosaic prophecy "of a prophet ... like unto me."⁵⁵ A second interesting observation is that even as God honored the enslaved Joseph and the repudiated Moses and equipped them for a service to Israel so He has given Jesus the place of supreme honor and power.⁵⁶ It follows then that the ἐκκλησία represents the true people of God. The whole past history of Israel was preparatory

51. Acts 7:51. The term "Holy Spirit" is "used here, as in the Rabbinic writings, with the special meaning of spirit of prophecy" (Cadbury and Lake, op. cit., p. 82).

52. Acts 7:52.

53. Acts 7:16-19. The prophecy of this event is related at 7:6.

54. Acts 7:42f.

55. Acts 7:37.

56. Acts 7:55-56

for the future church,⁵⁷ each new stage of that history foreshadowing in some manner the church to come. The new fellowship was based upon a new covenant which emphasized the requisite of obedience to the will of God and simultaneously undercut the prerogatives of race -- of which the Temple was the visible symbol (see 7:41f.). The new community had entered into a higher relation to God, for which the ancient localized ritual had no significance. Thus Christianity had begun to feel its way toward its universal mission.⁵⁸

The result of Stephen's activity was the first rupture between the Church and Judaism.⁵⁹ To Stephen himself the result was death: to the Church it was the commencing of persecution.⁶⁰ Yet, the Church "maintained her position, and what seemed likely to prove her ruin became the first memorial of her advance through the world."⁶¹

The significance of Stephen's work is seen in the events closely attendant upon it. "Those who were scattered passed through the land preaching the word."⁶²

One of these refugees from the persecution was Philip, who fled to Samaria where he preached "the Messiah" apparently without hesitation to the inhabitants. In spite of competition from

57. It is significant that Stephen described the ancient people under the specific name of "the ekklesia in the wilderness." But see Cadbury, op. cit., ad. loc.

58. Cf. E. F. Scott, The Beginning of the Church, pp. 241-245.

59. Cf. J. Weiss, op. cit., p. 171.

60. Wilfred Knox affirmed that the significance of the persecution was that Jerusalem had once again rejected the truth (St. Paul and the Church at Jerusalem, p. 66).

61. Weiszäcker, op. cit., p. 62.

62. Acts 8:4.

Simon Magus to whom "all gave heed, from the least to the greatest, saying, 'This man is that Power of God which is called Great,'"⁶³ Philip won adherents to the Gospel. When the Samaritans "believed Philip bringing the good news about the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they -- both men and women -- were baptized."⁶⁴

The conversion of Samaritans posed a problem to the Christian community. They were the first non-Jewish converts to Christianity. When the Jerusalem community received the report of their conversion, they despatched Peter and John to investigate the situation.⁶⁵ Was it to be necessary that the Samaritan believers renounce their own traditions in favor of Jewish tenets in order to become Christians?⁶⁶ Must one have to be a Jew first, if he would be a Christian? This was the problem which confronted the two apostles. Apparently they decided in the negative. Obviously they were convinced of the propriety of the Samaritan converts, because "they prayed for a manifestation of the divine approval to justify them in ratifying the work of Philip."⁶⁷ Their request was granted. The imposition of hands was followed by the descent of the Holy Spirit in an unmistakable form. Thus the Samaritans

63. Acts 8:10.

64. Acts 8:12.

65. Loisy contends that Peter's intervention at Samaria represents a tendency to exalt the memory and exaggerate the power of the Apostles, and is, hence, a late tradition (op. cit., p. 124). But the "Apostolic element" in Acts is early rather than late. Indeed one of the central teachings of Acts is that the basis of the Church was Apostolic power. See Cadbury and Lake, op. cit., p. 92.

66. For a summary statement of the differences between Samaritan and Jewish beliefs, see The Beginnings of Christianity, I, 121f.

67. W. Knox, op. cit., p. 68.

were accepted into the Christian community. The thoroughness of this acceptance of Samaritan converts on the part of Peter and John is shown by their action on their return trip to Jerusalem. They proclaimed the Gospel in the Samaritan villages through which they passed.

This recognition of Samaritan converts involved certain arrangements with regard to proper and adequate worship. The natural and inevitable solution was that Samaritan converts should be content with the religious system which was provided by the Christian fellowship and the Samaritan synagogues. Thus the whole system of the Temple is seen to be not a necessary part of the divine revelation. Jewish-Christians might ignore this, but "the act of Philip committed the whole Church to its acceptance."⁶⁸

Another event⁶⁹ which contributed to the breach between the Christian community and Judaism was the conversion of Cornelius, a Roman centurion, by Peter.⁷⁰ On a supervisory tour of Christian communities,⁷¹ Peter came to Joppa where he lodged in the home of Simon the tanner. In nearby Caesarea Cornelius, a God-fearer,

68. Knox, op. cit., p. 170. Knox believes that Stephen thought that the Revelation of Jesus had in fact abolished the necessity of adhering to the Jewish religious system.

69. Foakes Jackson and Lake would place this incident after Peter's escape from prison. Then his preaching would have been practically contemporaneous with the Antiochean mission, and his return and defence in Jerusalem would be at about the same time as the Apostolic Conference (op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 156f.). Cf. Meyer, op. cit., pp. 146-150.

70. It is obvious from Acts 15:7 that Luke considered Peter as the first Christian preacher to a pagan audience (op. cit., p. 125). But there is too much that is Jewish in style and in the point of view of the narrator for the story to have originated with its Gentile author. See J. Weiss, op. cit., p. 310.

71. By this time there were Christians in Phoenicia and Cyprus (Acts 11:19) as well as at Damascus.

was directed in a vision to send for Peter. While Cornelius' delegation approached, Peter himself had a vision in which he was instructed to eat what he considered to be unclean. Peter demurred, but the instruction was repeated for a third time. As Peter debated the meaning of his vision, servants of Cornelius arrived, inquiring for him. Whereupon Peter was instructed by the Spirit to go with them, "Because I sent them."⁷² Thereupon Peter received the centurion's delegation, and after lodging them overnight he journeyed to Caesarea with them. On meeting Peter Cornelius did homage for which Peter rebuked him. "I too am a man."⁷³ When Peter entered the house, he found an audience of Cornelius' relatives and intimate friends. To them he remarked that social intercourse with Gentiles was forbidden by Jewish Law. However, he explained "God has shown me that I should not call any man common or unclean. So when I was sent for, I came without objection. I ask then why you sent for me?"⁷⁴ Cornelius answered by recounting his vision and added, "We are assembled to hear your divine message."⁷⁵ Then Peter expounded the Gospel to them.⁷⁶ While Peter spoke, the Spirit descended upon his audience.

72. Acts 10:20.

73. Acts 10:26.

74. Acts 10:28. Peter's interpretation of his vision (cf. Acts 11:3) connects it with the problem of social intercourse between Jews, whether they are Christian or not, and Gentiles. However, the outcome of Peter's visit, the exordium of Peter's message (Acts 10:34f.), Peter's defence of his action (Acts 11), and his reference to the matter at the Jerusalem conference (Acts 15:7ff.), link it with the problem of Gentile admission. Cf. Cadbury and Lake, *op. cit.*, p. 112.

75. Paraphrasing Acts 10:33b.

76. The exordium (verses 34f.) follows the lines of the primitive kerygma exactly. See Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching, pp. 52f.; cf. Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, pp. 82 and 84.

Accepting this as proof of their acceptance by God, Peter baptized them (although they were not circumcised) because as he explained later in defence of his action: "If then God gave the same gift to them as he gave to us when we believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was I that I could withstand God?"⁷⁷ W. Knox points out that this isolated precedent need not have effected the principle of admission into the Church. "The exceptional circumstances which accompanied it might well be urged as a proof that it could not be used as a test case for deciding the future conduct of the Church with regard to the Gentiles."⁷⁸

About the same time Cypriot and Cyrenaeen Jewish-Christian refugees of the persecution reached Antioch. It may be that these refugees were the first to preach to Gentiles.⁷⁹ The fact that "disciples were called 'Christians' first in Antioch" (Acts 11:26) implies that a radical break with Judaism took place there. Moreover, the sense of the passage, in spite of textual problems, requires that while at first others preached the Gospel exclusively to the Jews, certain men of Cyprus and Cyrene eventually proclaim-

77. Acts 11:17. Canon Streeter observed that Peter who had followed Jesus and opened his soul to His preaching instinctively apprehended the real attitude of our Lord towards the Gentile and towards the Law both at Caesarea and at Antioch (op. cit., p.44).

78. Op. cit., p. 152. We have already noted that Acts 15:7ff. tends to treat it as a test case.

79. Streeter in pointing out the fundamental fallacy of the Tübingen School said that Paul "was not the first to preach to Gentiles; that was the glory (Acts 11:20) of unnamed men of Cyprus and Cyrene" (op. cit., pp. 44-45). Cf. Loisy, op. cit., p. 122. If this be so, we must date Paul's conversion during the persecution of the Hellenists (which is likely) and place the evangelization of Antioch as following immediately after Stephen's death (so Knox, op. cit., p. 125); or else, we must assume that Paul's first approach to the Gentiles followed Barnabas' trip to Tarsus for him (Acts 11:25ff.).

ed the good news to non-Jews.⁸⁰ But it is not explicitly said that Gentiles were first converted at Antioch. In fact in Acts "emphasis is laid on the successive and, one might say, repeated beginnings of Gentile Christianity." Note 2:1-42, 8:26-40, 10:1-11:18, 11:19ff., 13-14. Moreover, the report passages (such as 11:1-3, 18; 14:27; 15:3, 4, 12; one recurs as late as 21:19f.) show that the author did not regard the conversion of the Gentiles as a single new departure.⁸¹

The situation at Antioch seems to have been favorable to the Gospel. Racial discrimination was beginning to disappear. Many Gentiles had become Jewish proselytes.⁸² The traditional hostility was absent. Consequently the Jews were not so resentful nor were the Gentiles so contemptuous toward a Jewish sect which tended to obliterate the distinction between Jew and Gentile.⁸³ Many at Antioch, both Jew and Gentile, were converted. The missionaries recognized no necessity for imposing on their converts the

80. J. H. Ropes concludes that the text should read Ἑλληνοῦς, although Ἑλλήνας is possible. "In either case, the context requires a contrast between Jews and non-Jews, and no reason appears why the latter should not be designated by the term 'Greek-speaking persons.' The specific meaning 'Greek-speaking Jews' belongs to the word only where that is clearly indicated by the context, as is certainly not the case here" (The Beginnings of Christianity, vol. 3, p. 106).

81. Cadbury, op. cit., vol. 5, p. 66.

82. For a summary statement of the Jewish preparation of the Hellenistic world for Christianity, see Loisy, op. cit., p. 126. The most fruitful soil for the Christian message was found among the "God-fearers," the fringe of Gentiles around every Jewish synagogue. The reasons why Paul started his missions in the synagogues were 1) his desire to win his own people and 2) his recognition of the importance of these Gentile adherents of the Synagogue for the whole future of Christianity. This feature of Jewish synagogue life was a vital praeparatio evangelica.

83. Josephus, B. J. vii. iii. 3.

rite of circumcision in which they saw only part of the antiquated Jewish system. Table fellowship between Jewish Christians and uncircumcised Gentile Christians ensued.

Advised of these proceedings the Church at Jerusalem despatched Barnabas in the absence of the Twelve to warn the community at Antioch of the dangers implicit in their unbridled enthusiasm.⁸⁴ However, Barnabas was so overwhelmed by the signs of the Spirit manifest among the converts that he joyfully approved the action.

It does not seem unreasonable to connect the Alexandrian church with the work of Stephen and to place its origin at about this time. Although the first definite historical evidence of Alexandrian Christianity comes from the last quarter of the second century,⁸⁵ there are clues that indicate the possibility that Christianity had reached Alexandria at a very early date.⁸⁶

1) The Western text of Acts 18:25 has the remarkable read-

84. "The problem which the liberalism of the Antioch missionaries had found so easy of solution did not seem so simple to Hebrew believers of the original community. How, they asked, could the promises be inherited by those who bore not the mark of the chosen people, by those who were not partners of the holy covenant with its ritual conditions set by revelation direct from God?" (Loisy, op. cit., p. 142).

85. Namely, the statement by Clement of Alexandria that Pantaenus founded in the Egyptian metropolis, apparently about A. D. 180, the Catechetical School which became the "Lyceum" of many great philosophical theologians (see Streeter, op. cit., p. 234).

86. The Alexandrian church of A. D. 180 was fully formed and enjoyed considerable influence. It had already produced some notable heretics (Loisy, op. cit., pp. 130ff.). Streeter finds solid reasons for connecting the epistle of "Barnabas" (dated A. D. 79 by Lightfoot) with Alexandria (op. cit., pp. 236ff.).

ing, "who (i.e., Apollos) had been instructed in his own country (i.e., Alexandria) in the word of the Lord."⁸⁷ "If this reading were right, or a correct inference (and this is not impossible), it would prove that Christianity had reached Alexandria ... not later than A. D. 50."⁸⁸

2) It is interesting to note that Paul in writing to the Romans (ca. A. D. 58)⁸⁹ did not consider Alexandria as an available mission field.⁹⁰ If Christianity had not reached Alexandria, one would expect Paul to have been both eager and enthusiastic to evangelize that city of affluence. But the whole of Africa seems to have been outside Paul's horizon.⁹¹

3) There remains a third possible clue. Christians may have been involved in the disturbance at Alexandria in A. D. 41. S. Reinach found in the letter addressed by Claudius in A. D. 41 to the Alexandrians "la première allusion au christianisme dans l'histoire."⁹² However, W. Seston has conclusively shown in a study of the aforementioned letter that "la maladie commune a tout l'univers (which Claudius sought to stamp out) n'est pas le christianisme, mais la guerre civile gagnant comme une épidémie les juiveries de l'οἰκουμένη..."⁹³ Nonetheless, Jewish Christians may have been identified with their countrymen in this uprising.⁹⁴

87. Codex Bezae reads, *ὅς ἦν κατηχημένος ἐν τῇ πατρίδι τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου.*

88. Cadbury and Lake, *op. cit.*, vol. 4, p. 233.

89. Dodd dates Romans about 57-59; Sanday and Headlam, 58.

90. Rom. 15:23f.

91. See J. Weiss, *op. cit.*, p. 204.

92. *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, vol. 89, 1924, pp. 108f.

93. *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses*, 1931, p.304.

94. Loisy opines that Christian preaching probably had something to do with the movement (*op. cit.*, p. 382, fin. 17).

Philo's failure to mention the Christian movement is not necessarily disastrous to the supposition that Christianity was planted in Alexandria by A. D. 41.⁹⁵ An intellectual preoccupied with metaphysical and mystical allegory, on the one hand, and with political realism,⁹⁶ on the other, Philo could hardly be expected to make literary reference to a messianic lay movement.⁹⁷

The possibility that the Alexandrian church may date back into the first Christian generation forces the question, "If so, how and by whom?" Stephen's contact with Alexandrian Jews⁹⁸ may supply the answer. It is not unreasonable to suppose that in the persecution that followed the martyrdom of Stephen Alexandrian Jewish Christians carried the Gospel to Alexandria. "The probability is very high that the faith of Jesus, having once left Jerusalem and crossed the frontiers of Palestine, quickly penetrated Egypt and found its way to Alexandria."⁹⁹

Sometime after the establishment of the Christian community

95. See Craig, op. cit., p. 56. Cf. H. A. A. Kennedy, "We cannot tell whether he (Philo) ever came into contact with the Christian faith. The tradition of his meeting Peter at Rome (Eus. H. E. ii. 17. 1; Photius, Biblioth. Cof. 105; Suidas, s.v. Φίλων) seems to be legendary, based apparently on the notion that the Therapeutae, whom he describes in the De Vita Contemplativa, were followers of Mark, the disciple of Peter" (Philo's Contribution to Religion, p. 7).

96. See Goodenough, An Introduction to Philo Judaeus, chapter 3, "The Political Thinker."

97. It could be equally expected that Archbishop Temple would have made literary reference to Mormonism in England.

98. Acts 6:9. Whether the text refers to one or three synagogues is doubtful. Nevertheless, there was a synagogue of Alexandrians in Jerusalem. Rabbinic literature discusses the possibility of selling a synagogue. "The classical example given to prove the point is that Rabbi Eleazar ben Zadok (A. D. 100) purchased the synagogue of the Alexandrians (Tosefta, Megillah, iii. 6. 224)" (Cadbury and Lake, op. cit., vol. 4, p. 68).

99. Loisy, op. cit., p. 130.

at Antioch Barnabas and Paul united their efforts in a common mission enterprise.¹⁰⁰ Prof. T. W. Manson proposes that in the period immediately before "the first deliberately planned piece of aggressive mission of the Church,"¹⁰¹ Paul and Barnabas journeyed to Jerusalem¹⁰² to make certain that they "on the one side and the Jerusalem leaders on the other were at one with regard to the fundamentals of the Gospel, so that Paul's converts would be recognized by the authorities in Jerusalem as genuine

100. Luke prefaced the beginning of this joint mission venture with an account of Barnabas' trip to Tarsus for Paul and their subsequent return to Antioch (Acts 11:25ff.). Knox opines that the reason for Barnabas' bringing Paul to Antioch was that Barnabas desired the concurrence of a colleague in the recognition of the Antioch church (op. cit., pp. 158f., 163f., fn. 16). A recognition of Paul's apostolic status.

101. The Mission to Cyprus and Asia Minor (Acts 13:1ff.).

102. The difficulties in identifying this visit with either the second or third visits in Acts are patent. See F. C. Baur, Paul, His Life and Work, vol. 1, pp. 120-151; T. W. Manson, Ryl. Bul., XXIV, no. 1, pp. 59-80; K. Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, vol. 5, pp. 195-212; C. W. Emmet, The Beginnings of Christianity, vol. 2, pp. 265-297. If an identification must be made, the visit mentioned at Acts 11:30 seems the more probable occasion. The atmosphere of the visit (Gal. 2) is entirely different from that of the public apostolic conference (Acts 15). Moreover, the purpose of the two visits are irreconcilable unless we consider the decision of the Church to send Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem to have been a product of ἀποκάλυψις. Again, if we identify Acts 15 and Gal. 2, we can explain the inexplicable behavior of Peter at Antioch (Gal. 2:11ff.) only by supposing that Paul has told his story out of order. Baur thoroughly expounds these and other difficulties in making the Acts 15= Gal. 2 identification. T. W. Manson considers the main points of Baur's argument to be both "unanswered and unanswerable" (op. cit., p. 65, fn. 2). Equally important is the fact that an understanding about the essential elements of the Gospel would arise at a very early date. However, the identification of Acts 11:30 with Gal. 2 tends to break down in regard to the cause and object of the trip (but see G. S. Duncan, Galatians; Emmet, op. cit.; K. Lake, Earlier Epistles of Paul). Further, everything is so uncertain and undefined in Acts 11:30 that it induces Baur to regard it as fiction (op. cit., p. 120). But there is nothing suspicious in the story of Acts as it stands: the objections arise solely from the difficulty of finding room for it in Galatians (cf. Emmet, op. cit., pp. 272f.).

Christians and real members of the Church." The assurance of such recognition was vitally important to Paul because of his strong convictions about the unity of the Church as the body of Christ. The results of this visit (see Gal. 2) were 1) recognition of the fundamental sameness of Paul's gospel, 2) recognition of Paul's divine appointment, 3) division of mission areas, and 4) Paul's agreement to raise relief funds for the impoverished Jerusalem community.¹⁰³

Sometime later Peter arrived in Antioch.¹⁰⁴ Finding a common fellowship established between Jew and Gentile, Peter did not hesitate at first to eat with Gentiles. However, after a message of admonition arrived from James asking that Peter desist from this practice because its continuance would jeopardize the mission to the Jews, Peter withdrew from the table fellowship and with him in this action were Barnabas and the other Jews. This act effected a split in the Church.¹⁰⁵ And although strictly speaking it did not infringe upon Gentile liberty, it did manifest a contempt for those chosen and called of God Himself. Logically it meant that their baptism was non-existent.¹⁰⁶ It is possible to note a resemblance between their relation to the Judaizing portion of the Church and the relation of the

103. Ryl. Bul., XXIV, no. 1, pp. 64ff.

104. Acts does not report this episode. Perhaps, it was anticipated in 15:1. See Emmet, op. cit., p. 279. But Baur considers this omission an intentional veiling by Luke (op. cit., p. 134).

105. By his action "Peter destroyed something valuable -- a spirit born of the Gospel, which had made Jews and Gentiles ... forget their mutual prejudices and suspicions and sit down together as brethren" (T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 72).

106. J. Weiss, op. cit., pp. 273f.

"God-fearers" to the Synagogue. Respected for their confession yet they were not fully accepted because they did not embrace the law.

Paul was infuriated. Openly and snsparingly he censured Peter. The unity of the Church which he had sought to preserve had been broken by one act. Again he journeyed to Jerusalem to discuss this problem with the leaders of the Jerusalem church.

The problem before the subsequent conference was "on what basis can the fellowship of the Church be secured and continued?" Must the Gentile convert also become a Jewish proselyte in order to be fully accepted into the Christian fellowship?¹⁰⁷ Such a requirement Paul would regard as preposterous. He had just stated his position in a letter to the Galatians.¹⁰⁸

"We ourselves, who are Jews by birth ... know that a man is not justified by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Christ Jesus, in order to be justified by faith in Christ, and not by works of the law, because by works of the law shall no one be justified.... For if justification were through the law then Christ died to no purpose" (2:15a, 16, 21b).

The requirement was regarded by Peter also as absurd. Recalling his experience at Caesarea, he declared that God had given to Gentiles "the Holy Spirit just as he did to us; and he made no

107. Both the necessity calling for Peter's withdrawal from table-fellowship in Antioch and the Pharisaical demand for circumcision (Acts 15:5) suggest that full, practical acceptance of Gentiles into the Christian fellowship is contingent upon their accepting the Law.

108. Following Knox, op. cit., pp. 220ff. and 227ff. (note 5), and Duncan, op. cit., pp. xxii-xxxi, we date this epistle prior to the Apostolic Conference and consider S. Galatia to be its destination. The only serious difficulty to this early date is the implied two visits (τὸ πρότερον --4:13). But the second visit may be equated with the return visit (14:21) on the first missionary journey.

distinction between us and them, but cleansed their hearts by faith. Now therefore why do you make trial of God by putting a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear?"¹⁰⁹ The disciples themselves had been and were yet "people-of-the-land"¹¹⁰ who found the scribal minutiae of the Law heavy to bear. Their salvation had been effected through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ.¹¹¹ The same grace was manifest among the Gentile Christians through the presence of the Holy Spirit.¹¹² Therefore the Conference decided (James was the chairman) that the role of a Jew was not to be thrust upon the Gentile Christian.¹¹³ Table-fellowship between Jewish and Gentile Christians would be restored on the condition that the fellowship would take place over a kosher meal.¹¹⁴

109. Acts 15:8b-10.

110. Cf. G. F. Moore, The Beginnings of Christianity, vol. 1, p. 445. See Acts 4:13, which indicates that the Sanhedrin considered the apostles to be am ha- aretz. Cf. Cadbury and Lake, op. cit., vol. 4, p. 44.

111. Acts 15:11.

112. Acts 15:14; cf. 15:8.

113. Acts 15:19.

114. Acts 15:20 and 15:28. There are two well-worn problems here: text and interpretation. The two hang together. "The effect of the peculiar 'Western' readings is to exclude any food-law explanation, and virtually to compel the reading of the decrees as a compendium of moral requirements." But such an interpretation (supported by Burkitt, op. cit., p. 123) breaks down. "The idea that Paul merely demanded a minimum of good conduct from his converts is in flat opposition to the evidence of his Epistles where he places upon them the full law of Christ" (W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 119). On the other hand, legalistic Jewish Christians could never have supposed that the problems could be solved by whittling down moral standards (T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 74). The only alternative to the "ethical" interpretation is to understand the prohibitions in connection with Jewish dietary practice. And this interpretation has textual support. Origen (C. Celsus viii. 29), the Harris MS. of the Syriac Didascalia (cited by Preuschen in his commentary on Acts), and the Chester Beatty codex P⁴⁵ (for Acts 15:20) omit πορνεία from the list. In fact the only undisputed members of the list are ἄρτα and εἰδωλοθύτα. Ropes concludes: "In the East the Decree was correctly understood in the second century and later to relate to food, and under the influence of current custom the text was at first expanded by the addition of καὶ πνίκτων" (op. cit., p. 269).

The above sketch of the history of early Christianity down to the period of the Apostolic Conference reveals that there were two schools of propaganda within primitive Christianity. One of these groups, the Judaistic, centered around Jerusalem; its adherents were active in a much wider sphere later as Paul's epistles testify. The Judaizers accepted the Messiahship of Jesus; at the same time, they maintained their devotion to the Torah. For them the promises of the Old Covenant derived to the "New Israel;" the requirements of the Old Covenant they also considered to be valid. Consequently, they insisted that the Law must be adhered to -- by Jewish converts at any rate. Some of this group apparently desired that the Gentile converts should also become Jewish proselytes.¹¹⁵

The other school of propaganda, the Hellenistic, began with the group about Stephen. Paul and Peter also became adherents of this school. For them the Messiahship of Jesus effected the "New Israel," to whom the promises of the Old Covenant derive. But for them the only conditions for membership in the "New Israel" were belief in Jesus and possession of the Holy Spirit. The only reason for upholding the Law was that in being a Jew unto the Jew ~~the Jew might be won to Christ.~~

How these contradictory opinions came to be held among the devotees of the Lord Jesus Christ is an intriguing topic for study. The following pages will be devoted to an aspect of the

115. See Acts 15:1ff.; Cf. Gal. 6:13.

larger topic, namely, the query "Do the contradictory positions have substantial basis in the teaching of Jesus?"¹¹⁶

As a prelude to a study of the teaching of Jesus, we intend to outline the history of the Old Testament faith emphasizing the relation of the Gentile to it and to examine the bias of the several synoptic gospels.

116. Some critics have concluded from the absence of any trace of an appeal to the teaching of Jesus in the controversy that the synoptic tradition on this point is a product of the controversy. Note, for example, Foakes Jackson and Lake, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 317: With regard to Jesus' teaching and the Apostolic Conference they ask, "If he had really spoken as the gospels represent, would no one have made use of his words?"

CHAPTER II: THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL AND THE GENTILE

The distinctive Old Testament faith was in its origin the religion of a nation, namely Israel. It dates from the Exodus.¹ Indeed the same event marks the birth of the nation. It seems incontestable that the Israelitic national spirit originated in Yahweh's call of Israel to come out from Egypt.² Even when organic unity was yet absent in the period of the Judges, Israel's sense of national personality bound the tribes and families together.³ Moreover, this sense of inner unity enabled the people of Israel to assimilate the Canaanites, a more numerous and a more highly civilized people.

The basis upon which Israel came into existence was religious.⁴ She entered into nationhood because she trusted the promise of God. Before the Deliverance was a fait accompli, its announcement was made. Yahweh commanded Moses to inform the children of Israel that⁵

-
1. We are here treating as the distinctness of the Old Testament faith that which is found in the Covenant relation to Yahweh. Both the Elohist and the Priestly writer avoid the use of the proper name Yahweh for God before the time of Moses. The "J" tradition that God was known as Yahweh and that Israel was divinely elected in the time of Abraham seems to be a prologue necessary to the story of Israel which commences with the Exodus (A.G. Hebert, The Throne of David, p. 29). It most probably originated with Judah and the other southern tribes who entered Palestine in company with the Kenites from whom they assimilated Yahwism (H.H. Rowley, The Missionary Message of the Old Testament, p. 130).
 2. See J. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Israel, pp. 432f.; cf. K. Budde, The Religion of Israel to the Exile, p. 4.
 3. Organic unity was achieved only with the establishment of the monarchy. It is well to note that the prophets who gave greater distinctness to the peculiar character of Israel did not create this character but were themselves made in part by it.
 4. "In those days it was really the religion -- adherence to a particular God, and faith in him -- that created the nationality" (A. B. Davidson, Old Testament Prophecy, p. 22).
 5. Exodus 6:6f.

"I am Yahweh, and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will rid you out of their bondage, I will redeem you with an outstretched arm, and with great judgments: and I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God; and ye shall know that I am Yahweh your God, who bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians."

"It was because Israel trusted the announcement that she knew the experience." The deliverance from Egypt authenticated Yahweh and His prophet, Moses. The Exodus was to its participants a direct act of God.⁶

As a consequence of the Exodus, Israel entered into a covenant relation with Yahweh. The contract at Sinai laid down certain requirements upon Israel.⁷ 1) The primary demand was that the people take Yahweh as their only God. "Thou shalt have no other God before Me." The first word of the Decalogue is simply a demand for exclusive allegiance. It does not deny the reality of gods other than Yahweh, but declares that no other god is a legitimate object of Israel's worship. Whereas this concept of Yahweh does not preclude the realigy of other gods, there was a sense in which Yahweh was uniquely real. He was no hypostatization of the national spirit. On the contrary, Yahweh ex hypotesi had an existence prior to Israel. He stood high above the nation,

6. Rowley, The Rediscovery of the Old Testament, p. 70.

7. It is difficult to determine the extent of the Sinai covenant. Hebrew tradition attributes the entire legislation in the Pentateuch to Moses. As impossible as this tradition is, an element of truth underlies it. The whole subsequent development of religion in Israel presupposes two principles, a) the exclusive worship of Yahweh as Israel's only God and b) obedience to His will, from the beginning. All prophets claim to be in the Mosaic tradition. Cf. Jer. 11:1-8. It is reasonably certain then that the Ten Commandments were germane to the Sinai Covenant. That the present form of the Ten Commandments is obviously later than Moses does not preclude the probability that Moses formulated the principles in similar, pithy sentences. See J. Bewer, The Literature of the Old Testament, p. 30; cf. Rowley, The Missionary Message of O.T., p. 18.

not involved in it, nor bound by any natural tie to it, but only by a tie of gracious love, having redeemed it.⁸ The God of the Kenites had chosen for Himself another people. Moreover, He was no nature God. By the Deliverance, He had proven Himself to be, not merely a force in history, but the Controller of history.⁹ Hence Yahweh alone is worthy of adoration.¹⁰ 2) The corollary demand of allegiance to Yahweh is obedience to His will. That His demands were of an ethical nature is revealed by Israel's constant struggle against them, more or less, throughout her entire history. Israel was called to be a holy people. The religion established by Moses was something other than the religion of the Kenites. In choosing to deliver Israel Yahweh adopted the wrath of Moses and declared in effect that "it was a reflection of His own wrath at injustice and His compassion for the oppressed." He called Israel, not only that He might redeem her but that He might through her reveal His own character.¹¹ Consequently the demands of Yahweh even at Sinai were of an ethical nature. "Thou shalt not steal,... commit adultery,... kill,..." These commands quite naturally related in the first instance only to the relationships within the Israelitic community.

The limitations of this national faith are obvious. The relation of Yahweh to non-Israelites and the relation of Israelites to non-Israelites lay in this first instance beyond the perspective of the Old Testament. There are sufficient grounds for supposing

8. Davidson, op. cit., p. 24.

9. Cf. R. Kittel, The Religion of the People of Israel, p. 53.

10. Rowley, Missionary Message of O. T., p. 23.

11. Rowley, Rediscovery of O. T., pp. 84ff.; cf. Kittel, op. cit., p. 61.

that the Israelites considered the same type of relationship to exist between their neighbors and their respective tribal deities as existed between Israel and Yahweh. In subsequent years there was not the slightest question of the reality of other gods. The contest on Mt. Carmel (I Kings 18:19ff.) illustrates this point. The purpose of this duel was to show that Melkart was impotent in Israel and hence to drive him out of that land. Presumably Melkart was to be driven back into Tyre; there is no indication that he was to be expelled from Tyre also. Yahweh Himself was conceived to have been restricted to His people. When forced into exile David reproached Saul by saying that this exile was tantamount to forcing him to serve other gods (I Sam. 26:19).¹² Even when the thought first occurred that others might come to Yahweh, His presence and power were thought to be limited to the soil of Israel.¹³

PRE-EXILIC DEVELOPMENTS

A. THE YAHWIST

When the Israelites settled in Canaan, they adopted the culture of Palestine en bloc.¹⁴ The net result of this move for the religion of Israel was for at least a portion of the people to associate the cult of the Canaanite deities with the worship of Yahweh.¹⁵ The prophetic writing of the Yahwist (ca. 850 B.C.) was an attack on this syncretism.

12. Rowley, op. cit., p. 90.

13. E.g., Naaman (II Kings 5:17). This would appear to be a recension from the Mosaic concept of Yahweh who effected the deliverance from Egypt.

14. W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson, Hebrew Religion, Its Origin and Development, pp. 168f.

15. Hosea mentions the same syncretism (chapter 2).

The history by the Yahwist drew attention to the covenant. Yahweh alone is the God of Israel. To illustrate the exclusiveness of Yahweh's demand for allegiance, the Yahwist narrated how when some of the Israelites joined the Moabites in sacrificial festivals in honor of their gods Yahweh demanded in great anger that the ringleaders of this apostasy should be hanged.¹⁶

The most characteristic feature of this history is its vast sweep and universal setting.¹⁷ Creation (Gen. 2), ethical judgment upon the nations (Gen. 7ff., 10; Ex. 12ff.), and the directing of history are attributed to Yahweh.

The universal sweep of the Yahwist contemplates the Gentile in a general way. Eve is seen to be the mother of all mankind (Gen. 3:20). Perhaps the "mixed multitudes" of Ex. 12:38 are meant to represent Gentiles. Furthermore, there is the feeling that Israel is to be a source of blessing to all other nations. "In Abraham shall all the families of the earth be blessed."¹⁸ However, there is yet no vision of Gentiles coming into Israel. And the sense of mission to the Gentiles is even more remote.

B. THE ELOHIST

The second history of Israel, dating ca. 750 B. C., represents no significant advance in Israel's comprehension of the dynamic principles of her faith; nevertheless, it does present these principles more clearly than does "J."¹⁹

16. Nu. 25:1b, 2, 3b.

17. Bewer, op. cit., p. 71.

18. Gen. 12:3, 18:18; cf. 26:4.

19. Bewer, op. cit., p. 74.

Yahweh is different from other gods:

"Who is like unto Thee, O Yahweh, among the gods?
Who is like Thee, glorious in holiness,
Fearful in praise, doing wonders" (Ex. 15:11).

He guides and controls all in accordance with His purpose. This is most sharply delineated in the Joseph story:

"Ye meant evil against me, but God meant it for good, to bring to pass, as it is this day, to save much people... And now be not grieved, nor angry with yourselves, for God sent me before you to preserve life. For these two years has the famine been in the land: and there are yet five years, in which there shall be neither ploughing nor harvest. And God sent me before you to preserve you a remnant in the earth, and to save you alive by a great deliverance" (Gen. 50:20, 45:5-8).

The Elohist was a convinced theocrat. The desire for a king is an infringement upon the loyalty due to Yahweh.²⁰ Yahweh alone is king of Israel. His demand for allegiance and devotion is exclusive. Other gods are not even to be mentioned by name (Ex. 23:13). Sacrifice to them incurs the penalty of death (Ex. 22:20; 25:3a, 5).

This document does not have the universal sweep of "J," but it does contemplate the responsibility of the Israelite to the non-Israelite. This happens, it is true, only in a very restricted sense. The Israelite is to deal justly with the ger²¹ --the motive: "Ye were gerim in the land of Egypt" (Ex. 22:21,

20. I Sam. 10:19; cf. Ju. 8:22f.

21. The ger may be an Israelite or a foreigner. He may be a traveller. But the word ger seems to have its special sphere as designation of a great class of fellow citizens who are not born Israelites, but attach themselves to the Israelitic community. It is perhaps possible to perceive in the person of the ger one who was attracted to the faith of Israel even in early periods of Israelitic history. The ger is a plebian, a lesser citizen intermediary between the slave and the Israelitic citizen. He has certain personal freedoms including the right to hold property. See Pedersen, Israel, pp. 40ff., who urges that the "conquered, not wholly but nearly assimilated Canaanites may be recognized in the class of gerim."

23:9) -- and to give him the opportunity for Sabbath rest.²²

C. THE EIGHTH CENTURY PROPHETS

The first significant advance in Israel's understanding of her faith was achieved by the eighth century prophets. It was in the course of their work that the hope for a remnant became a vital part of Israel's faith.²³

The distinctive Hebrew-Jewish ideas of the covenant become sharply etched in the prophecies of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah. Yahweh's unique relation to Israel is the presupposition of all their prophecies. "You only have I known of all the families of the earth."²⁴ Israel is chasid to Yahweh.²⁵ The maintenance of this relationship is conditioned upon Israel's determined faithfulness to the demands of Yahweh. Israel's true faithfulness, or chesed, to Yahweh involves primarily Knowledge of God, and issuing from that, loyalty in true and proper worship, together with proper behavior in respect of the humanitarian virtues (Hosea 4:2, 13, 17).²⁶

But, alas, there is "no truth, nor chesed, nor knowledge of God" in Israel. "Swearing and breaking faith, killing and stealing, and committing adultery" are rife among the people (Hosea

22. Ex. 20:10. Cf. 23:12, where it is stated that one purpose of the Sabbath is to give rest to work animals, slaves, and gerim. "Six days thou shalt do thy work, and on the seventh thou shalt rest; וְהַבְּרִיָּה thine ox and thine ass may rest, and the son of thy handmaid and the ger may be refreshed."

23. The prediction of Elijah (I Kings 19:19f.) appears to be an anticipation of the later prophetic doctrine of the Remnant.

24. Amos 3:2. The Hebrew root יָרָא refers to intimate and personal concern rather than to mere awareness. See Norman Snaith, The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, p. 135.

25. Hosea 9:10; Israel as the first-fruits which are always godesh. See Snaith, op. cit., p. 35.

26. Cf. Snaith, op. cit., p. 122.

4:1f.) who have joined themselves to idols (Hosea 4:17) and high places (Hosea 4:13). Consequently, the judgment of God, instead of assuring national triumph over the enemies of Israel, will rest heavily upon the people.²⁷ "I will visit upon you all your iniquities" (Amos 3:2). Israel's doom is sealed; she will go into captivity.²⁸

Yet, with the exception of Micah the prophets were certain that Yahweh would not wholly forsake His covenant with Israel. From his own attitude to his wayward wife Hosea knew "that the chesed of God meant God's steadfast determination to be true to His share of the Covenant obligation whatever Israel did on her part."²⁹ Even Amos, who has so little to say of the love that will not relinquish Israel,³⁰ perceived that "the Lord, the God of hosts, may be gracious unto a remnant of Joseph" (5:14, cf. 3:12, 5:3). Yahweh will enter into a new covenant with Israel. "And I will betroth thee to Me in righteousness and in justice, and in chesed, and in mercies" (Hosea 2:19).

This insight into the covenant relationship comes simultaneously with clear perception of Yahweh's universal majesty and judgment.³¹ Yahweh is not merely Israel's God, or primus inter

27. Amos 5:18, 20.

28. Amos 7:11, 17; 5:27; 6:7; Micah 7:20; cf. Is. 5:25; 9:17, 19; and 28:1-13 where the condemnation of the North is unmitigated, and 6:13 where the prophet is convinced that disaster to Judah is sure; cf. also Hosea 2:9; 3:4.

29. Snaith, op. cit., p. 111.

30. Ibid., p. 117.

31. To Him belongs the sole control of the natural universe (Amos 4:13, 5:18). Moreover, Yahweh has sole direction of history. His interests are not confined to Israel. The migrations of other peoples are equally controlled by Him (Amos 9:7). Assyria is the instrument of His wrath (Is. 10:5f.). Furthermore, it is before Yahweh's tribunal that all nations are judged and condemned (Amos 1 and 2).

pares among the gods; but, Creator and King, He is set in His uniqueness far above all.³²

With this awareness of the breadth of Yahweh' majesty and dominion came the labor pains of universal faith. The providence of Yahweh is over all people. He has directed the migrations of other nations:

"Are ye not as the children of the Ethiopians unto me,
O children of Israel? saith Yahweh.
Have I not brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt,
And the Philistines from Caphtor,
And the Syrians from Kir?" (Amos 9:7).

Further, His salvation is to encompass other nations. In the floating oracle (Is. 2:3ff, Mic. 4:1ff.)³³ other nations are envisaged as gravitating to Jerusalem where they share in the faith of Israel and enter into her religious inheritance. This is not yet real universal faith. There is no trace here of any mission to the Gentiles. The conversion is thought of as a corollary of the prestige and glory of Israel. The conviction is expressed that Israel's faith is for all men. She can share its "full-fruits" only when all men share that faith.³⁴ And this will take place only in the Messianic Age.

D. THE DEUTERONOMISTS

The kingdom of God predicted by the prophets was the goal

32. Rowley, Rediscovery of O. T., pp. 91f.

33. The theme is developed in identical words in the separate passages and therefore quite possibly antedates both prophets. For the difficulty of dating this oracle, see Rowley, Israel's Mission to the World, pp. 3-5.

34. Rowley, Rediscovery of O. T., p. 139.

of the Deuteronomists (ca. 620 B. C.).³⁵ It was their aim to bring in the Messianic Age by legislating holiness in Israel. "Israel is to become a holy people, governed by the will of God."³⁶

This reform was based upon three principles. 1) Yahweh alone is God, He alone is to be worshipped, and His worship is to be purged of all heathen elements (Deut. 5:1-21, 6:49, 12:29-14:2). 2) There is only one sanctuary where Yahweh may be worshipped and His oracle consulted (Deut. 12:2-28). 3) Yahweh requires true social morality and wholehearted worship in accordance with the purified sacrificial system (Deut. 12-26, 10:12-21 with which compare Micah 6:8).³⁷

Even with the narrowing focus of their interest the Deuteronomists were not oblivious to the non-Israelite. The dicta concerning the ger are numerous. He is no longer merely an accredited candidate for just treatment (5:14, 24:17, 24:14, 27:19), charity (14:29, 24:19), and love (10:18-19). He has an active place in the religious life of the nation. He is represented as being in attendance at the giving of the covenant (29:10f.). He is to be taught to fear Yahweh and to know the Law (31:12). He is to take part in the Festival of Weeks (16:11, 16:14). He is to rejoice

35. The reform instituted by the Deuteronomists in the reign of Josiah came in the wake of a long period of religious syncretism. The cults of the sun, moon, and stars, especially of Ishtar, came inevitably with Assyrian suzerainty during the reign of Manasseh. There followed a "recrudescence of the old forms of superstition, witchcraft, necromancy, and of the familiar worship of Baal and his consort Asherah in the especially heinous form of Moloch worship with its human sacrifices." Yahweh retained His place as King of heaven. But His place was no long exclusive. See Bewer, op. cit., p. 121. Cf. Oesterley and Robinson. op. cit., p. 211.

36. C. H. Cornill, Prophets of Israel, p. 83.

37. The Reformers considered their work as nothing new, as only a modern form of the inherent truths of the Mosaic faith. See Deut. 5:1ff.

in the blessings of the covenant upon Israel (26:11). Yet, there remains a strong conviction that the ger's place in the covenant is subordinate and not essential. An animal which had died of natural causes may either be given to the ger or sold to the nekar, although the Israelite himself must not eat it (14:21). A reference to the blood law, this regulation indicates that though the ger might be joined to the Israelitic faith, he was not necessarily so.

Further evidence that the Deuteronomists contemplated the reception of non-Israelites into the faith of Israel is found in the exclusion laws. The Ammonite and the Moabite are absolutely excluded along with the eunuch and the bastard (23:1-6). On the other hand, the exclusion of the Edomite and the Egyptian is qualified. "The children of the third generation that are born unto them shall enter the assembly of Yahweh" (23:8).

But Israel is "henceforth essentially separated from other people."³⁸

E. JEREMIAH

From the great prophet of the seventh century B. C. comes the first statement that the gods of the heathen are not real.³⁹ It is not surprising then that the standards which Jeremiah established and the judgment which he declared concerned the world.⁴⁰

A universal God,⁴¹ Yahweh yet remains peculiarly the God of

38. A. Bertholet, Die Stellung der Israeliten und der Juden zu den Fremden, p. 87.

39. "Vanities of nations" (14:22), imaginative creations of their worshippers (2:11, 28; 5:7; passim), they shall perish (10:11).

40. Cf. A. C. Welch, Jeremiah, p. 192.

41. The true God (10:10), Creator (10:12; 14:22), Controller of history (15:16; 19:25; passim).

Israel.⁴² And although Israel has broken the covenant,⁴³ Yahweh is reluctant to abandon her. Even though Israel is incapable of repentance (13:23) which is the only way to salvation (7:3, 5f.; 18:11; 26:13; 35:15), Yahweh's love for her remains (31:3). For Ephraim, His dear son, His pleasant child, now long since strayed and lost, Yahweh does deeply long (31:20). To Judah, the harlot, He is the forgiving Husband (2:1-3; 3:12-15,20).

The dilemma of God's righteousness and His steadfast chesed was solved by Jeremiah in the following manner.⁴⁴ After seeing the whole national structure tumble, he observed how the migratory birds returned each year. They know the time of their coming. How is it that the people of Yahweh do not know His mishpat?⁴⁵ Jeremiah answers that Israel is not at the mercy of circumstances.⁴⁶ God Himself will effect a return of Israel. Yahweh will make a new covenant with both North and South (31:31-33). In that day He will forgive their sins, men will have the Law written on their hearts, and each man himself shall know Yahweh. Thus by the gift of new hearts, Yahweh's chesed will redeem Israel. Here it is emphasized that membership in the true people of God will be a matter of disposition and character rather than of birth.

42. The frequency of the phrase "Yahweh of hosts, God of Israel" is remarkable.

43. 11:8ff. For Jeremiah, as for Hosea, there was one sin, the fruitful mother of many: "the people knew not the way of Yahweh" cf. 5:4 (Welch, op. cit., p. 185).

44. See Snaith, op. cit., p. 121.

45. Ibid., fn. 1: "It is impossible to interpret this word here by any one English word. It means rightful custom, ordained of God, and established by continual repetition. God's mishpat for the swallow involves her regular return. God's mishpat for man involves his return also."

46. Illustrated by the oracle in the potter's house (ch. 18). See Welch, op. cit., p. 224.

Consonant with the inwardness of the new covenant is the promise that Gentiles who "will diligently learn the ways of my people, to swear by My name, as Yahweh liveth" will have a place in Israel (12:16). Furthermore, there is the vision of nations coming to Yahweh:

"O Yahweh,... unto thee shall the nations come from the end of the earth, and shall say, Our fathers have inherited nought but lies, even vanity and things wherein there is no profit. Shall a man make unto himself gods, which are no gods? Therefore behold, I will cause them to know, this once will I cause them to know My hand and My might; and they shall know that My name is Yahweh" (16:19ff.).

Compare 3:17 in which all nations are depicted as assembled before Yahweh in Jerusalem. But this accession of Gentiles to Yahweh will come only in the future.⁴⁷ These visions of universal acclamation to Yahweh are consistent with Jeremiah's sense of universal mission. "I have appointed thee a prophet unto the **ב'ג'ל**." ⁴⁸

EXILIC PERIOD

Prophetic voices arose during the Exile to trumpet the conviction that penitent Israel would be delivered by Yahweh in a New Exodus, be united to Him by a new Covenant, receive the outpouring of His Spirit, see His glorious Presence return to dwell in their midst, and all nations would then come to share in the glorious knowledge of the one true God, the God of Israel.

A. EZEKIEL

The overwhelming compulsion behind Ezekiel's prophecy was

47. Cf. Bertholet, op. cit., p. 116.

48. 1:5; cf. 1:10 and chapters 25 and 46ff. Welch points out that the word **ב'ג'ל** used here is reserved for foreign nations with two exceptions, Zeph. 2:9 and Ps. 106:5, where for the sake of parallelism it indicates Israel (op. cit., p. 38)

the sovereign holiness of Yahweh. He is King in heaven, omnipotent. The other gods are but His ministers (or parts of His throne).⁴⁹ With the same omnipotence He rules over the nations (ch. 25-32). He is the Author of all great movements in the world (38:16, 23). His rule of the nations is the judgment of the nations. His rule is moral. He hates evil and loves justice. Yet, He has no pleasure in the death of the wicked: His will is that men should live (18:23; 33:11).

Nevertheless, Yahweh is especially the God of Israel.⁵⁰ He purposed to be King over Israel (ch. 20). But Israel has turned to other gods (ch. 23). She has been guilty of many social abominations (ch. 22; cf. ch. 18). Israel's harlotry is a source of grief to Yahweh. Israel was meant to be Yahweh's revelation of Himself to mankind (ch. 20).

Israel's sinfulness has necessitated the destruction of the state. Yahweh's love, however, will find a way to restore Israel, even though she has lost the capacity for repentance.⁵¹ The Spirit of God will create new hearts which will turn to Him in sincerity and which will give loyal obedience to His Law (36:25-27, 31; cf. 11:19f.; 18:31). Only a remnant will react, however, to Divine grace; the rest are doomed (20:34-39; 34:17-22; cf. 5:1-14). But this Remnant will be a righteous people who will reveal the character of Yahweh to the world.⁵²

49. See the inaugural vision, ch. 1; cf. ch. 9.

50. Ezekiel traces the relation of Yahweh to Israel back before Sinai to Jacob (28:25) and even to Abraham (33:24). But the covenant of the Exodus had central place in the relation of Yahweh to Israel (ch. 20).

51. Cf. Snaith, op. cit., p. 121f.

52. 20:41; 28:25; 36:23; 37:28; 39:25ff. Cf. Davidson, Ezekiel, p. 279.

Although Ezekiel expounds the inwardness and individuality of religion,⁵³ his eschatology is occupied almost exclusively with the destiny of Israel. The prophet does not zealously contemplate the conversion of the Gentiles.⁵⁴ Perhaps the proselyte is anticipated in the remarkable passage which ascribes to the ger an inheritance in restored Israel.⁵⁵ The prophet obviously anticipates universal acclaim to the holiness and power of Yahweh.⁵⁶ But how much is implied in the oft-repeated words, "Thou shalt know that I am Yahweh," is not clear.⁵⁷ One passage foresees that all nations will seek refuge under the rule of the Messiah (17:23). Moreover, in saying that Sodom and Samaria "shall return to their former estate" Ezekiel anticipates "the conversion to Yahweh even of people like Sodom" and Samaria.⁵⁸ But Ezekiel remains preeminently a prophet of restored Israel. He beholds a universal God; yet, he scarcely considers a universal faith.

B. DEUTERO-ISAIAH

The greatest heights of pre-Christian religion were attained by Deutero-Isaiah. He was the first to attain full and explicit monotheism.⁵⁹ Yahweh is the only God.⁶⁰ Yet, He remains pri-

53. This principle (first elicited by Jeremiah) is followed to certain important conclusions (see ch. 18; cf. 14:17-20).

54. 44:9 excludes the Gentile from the sanctuary.

55. 47:21-23. The only difference here between the gerim and the Israelites is one of genealogy, and it has been superseded (Pedersen, op. cit., p. 42). Cf. 14:7ff., where the same fidelity to Yahweh is demanded from the ger as from the Israelite. And 22:29 enjoins treatment for the ger like that for the Israelite.

56. 38:16, 23; 20:14; 28:25; 36:23; 37:38; 39:25ff.; cf. Is.

57. Cf. Davidson, op. cit., p. liii.

54:4f.

58. Ibid., p. 119.

59. The passages which attribute explicit monotheism to Solomon (I Kings 8:60) and Hezekeah (II Kings 19:15) reflect the influence of Deutero-Isaiah. See Rowley, Rediscovery of O. T., p. 92.

60. "I am Yahweh, ... besides Me there is no other God" (45:6; cf. 45:22).

marily God of Israel.⁶¹ The prophet's primary task is to comfort the exiles (40:1) with the assurance that they are to be returned to Zion.⁶² However, the prophet's task does not end there. He also calls Israel to a mission. Yahweh is the God of all nations and desires the worship of all men.⁶³ Yahweh's righteousness is perceived to be effecting the salvation of men.⁶⁴ God's special relationship to Israel is not merely one of privilege.⁶⁵ Yahweh has revealed Himself peculiarly to Israel in order that she might lead the nations to Him.

"I, Yahweh, have taken thee in tsedeq,
And have taken thine hand;
I have formed thee and set thee for a covenant of the people,
And a light to the nations,
To open blinded eyes,
To bring forth the prisoner from the dungeon,
And from the prison-house them that sit in darkness" (42:6f.;
cf. 45:5).

This conception of Israel's vocation receives its noblest expression in the Servant Songs.⁶⁶ In the first of these Songs the

61. In language reminiscent of Hosea, Deutero-Isaiah defined the relationship. "For thy Maker is thy Husband."

62. 54:7.

63. 45:22-23.

64. In Deutero-Isaiah, the word tsedeq-tsedeqah has come to mean "salvation" (Snaith, op. cit., p. 92, *passim*).

65. Cf. Bertholet, op. cit., p. 119.

66. Here I do not presume to identify the Servant as Israel (as does L. E. Browne, Early Judaism, pp. 18-20) but only to find in the Servant Songs the noblest expression of the mission which was Israel's also. The oracles which surround the Servant Songs indicate that the mission of the Servant was to perfect that to which Israel was called. Christopher North has clearly stated the difficulty of identifying the Servant as Israel. "The Prophet can hardly have been blind to the inadequacy of his own people to be the perfect Servant of Yahweh. Nor was he.... After all, no nation or, for that matter, no religious community ever has acted, or perhaps ever can act, as the Servant does in the last Song, and the Prophet was realist enough to know it" (The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah, p. 217). The thought of the prophet upon the identity of the Servant seems to have been fluid. This accounts for the variety of identifications. Critical scholarship is loathe to make a definite identity without some reservation. In his authoritative discussion North concludes that the 'ebb and flow' of the prophet's thought was "from collective Israel to an individual who was neither himself nor anyone who had lived hitherto" -- i.e. the Messiah to come (op. cit., p. 216).

writer unites the election of Israel with the thought that Yahweh is the God of all men. Yahweh is the speaker.

"Behold, My Servant, whom I uphold;
My chosen in whom My soul delighteth:
I have put My spirit upon him;
He shall bring forth mishpat to the nations" (42:1).

That the privilege and honor of being chosen of God is one of service, namely, to make the character and will of God known to men -- both Israelite and Gentile -- is more clearly elucidated in the second of the Songs. The Servant speaks:

"He said to me, Thou art My Servant;
Israel, in whom I will be glorified....
And now saith Yahweh that formed me from the womb to be
His Servant,
To bring Jacob again to Him,
And that Israel might be gathered to Him:....
It is too light a thing that thou shouldest be My Servant
to raise up the tribes of Jacob,
And to restore the preserved of Israel:
I will also give thee for a light to the nations,
That My salvation may reach to the end of the earth" (49:3,5,6).

"Israel alone is an insufficient inheritance for the God of all the earth, and her redemption must be completed and perfected in the larger redemption of all mankind."⁶⁷ That this mission can only be accomplished through suffering is the lofty concept of the third and fourth Songs (50:4-9; 52:13-53:12).⁶⁸

However, the lofty heights of universal faith attained by Deutero-Isaiah had little effect on the subsequent course of the Hebrew faith. Israel had ceased to be a state; she had remained a community only because she had adopted a policy of religious exclusiveness. Consequently, her universality was restricted and Judaism became a national cult. While this development is in-

67. Rowley, Israel's Mission to the World, p. 18.

68. Cf. Cornill, op. cit., pp. 142f., where he identifies the Servant as Israel.

consistent with the essential message of Deutero-Isaiah, that great prophet stimulated it, perhaps unwittingly. He placed undue stress on Israel's glory (45:25; cf. 43:3f.; 41:15f.; 49:23). Further, he indicated that fellowship with Yahweh depended on an individual becoming a member of Israel (44:5).

C. THE PRIESTLY WRITINGS

The new nationalism was aided and abetted by the Priestly writings which began to take shape in Babylon ca. 500 B. C. The ideal of the Priestly writer was a holy nation, pure and undefiled. The Israel of God must reflect His purity. Whereas the prophets emphasized moral purity as the means to this end, the Priestly writer placed the greater emphasis on ritual holiness. His preoccupation is obvious in his account of history which provided the sanctity of age to the cornerstones of the cult. The Sabbath is one of the foundations of the world (Gen. 1). The rite of circumcision dates from Abraham (Gen. 17). The giving of the Noachian laws, prohibiting murder and the eating of blood by all mankind, provides the climax to the story of the Deluge (Gen. 9:4-6). The institution of the Passover is the penultimate of his account of the Exodus (Ex. 12:1-14:28).

Israel must be pure. Defilement could come not only from heathen practices but also from association with heathen people. A case in point are the Midianites, contact with whom led to a trespass against Yahweh, thus necessitating the extermination of that people (Nu. 31). Compare the patriarchal story (Gen. 28:1-9) in which intermarriage with foreigners was deprecated. The defilement which is inevitable from such practice may be seen in

the story of the son of an Egyptian father and an Israelite mother who in a strife with an Israelite blasphemed Yahweh (Lev. 24:10ff.; cf. Nu. 25:5-13). Strictly speaking, therefore, the Israelite should have nothing to do with foreigners. But that was impossible. Foreigners who had attached themselves to the Israelitic community and depended upon the mercy of the Israelites for their existence lived in the Palestinian community. The ger is to be treated as a native Israelite, and "thou shalt love him as thyself" (Lev. 19:34). The gerim are included in the congregation of Israel (Ex. 12:19).⁶⁹ Indeed the same ideal of holiness applied to the ger as to the native. "Ye shall have one manner of law for the ger as for the native" (Lev. 24:22; cf. Nu. 15:15f., 29). Here was the basis for a less exclusive policy, namely, that membership in Yahweh's congregation depended upon fulfilment of the Law, not on Israelitic parentage. However, although two of the finest statements of the affinity of mankind are found in his account of history (Gen. 1 and 10),⁷⁰ the Priestly writer does not make this emphasis. For him "the Israelites are the people of the law, separate from other nations, without any sense of obligation to bring the true religion to the peoples of the world."⁷¹

69. Along with the poor, the gerim are to be treated justly and charitably (Lev. 19:33; 19:10).

70. Of the latter, J. E. McFadyen has commented that it "was penned by some Greatheart who had cast a loving gaze across the nations of the earth as he knew them, and seen in them one great family" (The Message of Israel, p. 251).

71. Bewer, op. cit., p. 275.

POST-EXILIC PERIOD

The history of this period is the story of the implementation of the **P**riestly ideal, or the story of how, despite some strong protests, the conception of Yahweh's people as an exclusive body developed and penetrated the whole life of the community. It is well to note in beginning that this development was neither fortuitous nor merely a betrayal of the "universalism" of the faith. It was an effort to preserve the faith.

The land to which the exiles returned was inhabited by a heterogeneous people whose faith lacked vitality. Religion in Palestine had been thoroughly vitiated through contamination with heathen culture. This danger had been averted in Babylon by a policy of exclusiveness. Consequently it was natural that the exiles would attempt to implement the same policy in Palestine in order to preserve the vitality of their faith. Their immediate task was "to re-establish Yahwism in the land, to rebuild the Temple, and to get the observances of religion functioning regularly once more."⁷² The acceptance of the Priestly code championed by Ezra was instrumental to this task. It made Israel a separate people.

Two steps may be perceived in this separation. They are recorded in the history of Ezra-Nehemiah. First, inter-marriage with foreigners was banned. Ezra the scribe (ca. 458 B. C.) made the drastic demand (9:1-10:44, esp. 10:11; cf. Nu. 25:6-18) that existing marriages with foreign women should be dissolved. His efforts, however, were apparently fruitless, for Nehemiah (445-

72. Rowley, Israel's Mission to the World, p. 43.

433 B. C.) found it expedient to denounce foreign marriages (13:23ff.; 10:30). It is tempting to condemn these actions as narrow nationalism or racialism, but to do so would be to misunderstand completely the work of both Ezra and Nehemiah. Their injunctions were based not on mere hatred of foreigners, but on passionate concern for the maintenance of the religion of their fathers.⁷³ There is both internal and external support for this conclusion. a) Both Ezra and Nehemiah ground their demands in appeal to religious loyalty. Ezra pointed out the uncleanness of foreigners and the danger implicit in associating with them (9:11-14). "Now therefore make confession unto Yahweh,... and do His pleasure; and separate yourselves from the people of the land and from the foreign woman" (10:11). Nehemiah clearly recalled the folly which inter-marriage had perpetrated in the case against our God by marrying foreign women" (13:2)? b) The book of Ruth which comes from this period indicates that marriage with proselytes would be permissible.⁷⁴

The second step was attendant upon the first. It was the Samaritan schism, which is merely alluded to at Nehemiah 13:28f.⁷⁵

"And one of the sons of Joiada, the son of Eliashib the highpriest, was son in law to Sanballat the Horonite; therefore I chased him from me. Remember them, O my God, because they have defiled the priesthood, and the covenant of the priesthood and of the Levites."

73. Cf. Rowley, op. cit., p. 45.

74. Those who consider the book of Ruth to have been a protest against nationalism (e.g., Browne, op. cit., p. 216) think that the whole point of the story is the Moabite ancestry of David, and they overlook the fact that Ruth was a proselyte before she married Boaz. See Rowley, op. cit., p. 47.

75. In the subsequent paragraphs I am following J. A. Montgomery, The Samaritans, The Earliest Jewish Sect, Their History, Theology, and Literature, pp. 66ff.

The Old Testament vouchsafes nothing more about this scandal and in no way connects it with the Samaritan schism. The sole authority for such an identification is Josephus (A. J. xi. 7. 2; c. 8).⁷⁶ The events are as follows.

Sanballat, a political figure in Samaria, seeking to ally himself with the religious hierarchy in Jerusalem, arranged a marriage between Nikaso, his daughter, and Manasse, a possible candidate to the highpriesthood -- possibly while Nehemiah was absent (Neh. 13:6). But the marriage brought upon Manasse the odium of the Jews, who gave him the choice between abdicating his priestly rights and divorce of his wife. (Nehemiah would seem to indicate that he alone expelled the unworthy priest.) Manasse presented the case to Sanballat who built a temple for him upon Gerizim and procured for him the dignity of highpriest. Meanwhile many priests and Levites seceded Manasse. Such was the beginning of the Samaritan sect. That the Samaritans remained a distinct and separate sect was due to the excluding policy of Judaism. A quotation from Montgomery⁷⁷ without comment is sufficient here:

From the dependence which the separated faction ever afterwards exhibited upon the spiritual primacy of Jerusalem, it appears that the crystallization of the dissenters into an independent sect was due rather to their excommunication by the Jewish church than to their own will.

Having become a separate people did not mean that Israel was a closed body. In fact one may with all due caution affirm that the subsequent history of Judaism was an attempt to universalize the National faith of Israel.⁷⁸

76. Wellhausen (Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte, p. 180) and others make this identity, although Josephus dates this event in 332 B. C. Josephus apparently relied upon a Samaritan fable which connected the beginning of the sect with the glorious era of Alexander.

77. Op. cit., p. 69.

78. Cf. Moore, Judaism, p. 230.

The post-exilic faith had visions of the nations sharing in the fellowship of Yahweh. When we examine some of those recorded in the Old Testament canon,⁷⁹ we readily see that the visions were not associated with any eager yearning to redeem the Gentiles from their sins. Gentile entrance into the faith was perceived to be either a) a corollary of the extension of Yahweh's glory,⁸⁰

"O Thou that hearest prayer, unto Thee shall all flesh come"
(Psalm 65:2).

"Princes shall come out of Egypt; Ethiopia shall soon stretch out her hands unto God" (Psalm 68:31).

"All nations whom Thou hast made shall come and worship before Thee, O Lord; and shall glorify Thy name" (Psalm 86:9).

or b) a corollary of the glory of Zion,⁸¹

"Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion: for, lo, I come, and I dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord. And many nations shall be joined to the Lord in that day, and shall be My people: and I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the Lord of hosts hath sent me unto thee" (Zechariah 2:10, 11).

or c) even the corollary of the glory and fame of Israel

"Thus saith the Lord of hosts: In those days it shall come to pass, that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you: for we have heard that God is with you" (Zechariah 8:23).

"And the Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising" (Is. 60:3).

Elsewhere, as in the apocalyptic passage, the omnipotence of Yahweh will simply provide (Is. 25:6-8).

79. No attempt is made here to date these visions other than to place them in the post-exilic period nor are they even listed chronologically. The former is a tedious task beset with difficulty. Neither it nor the latter is necessary to our study.

80. Note further Psalm 82 in which the Psalmist declares that the inability and indifference of the gods to righteousness in Yahweh's world is leading to chaos. Consequently these gods will die. And Yahweh will take their place, judging the earth and inheriting the nations. See Welch, The Psalter, pp. 43ff.

81. Note further Is. 56:6f. and Zech. 8:20-23, in which the prevailing temper is "to so great and holy a place all nations should turn" (Rowley, op. cit., p. 28)

These visions, cf. Ps. 93 and 97, have an eschatological setting. This holds true of the visions in the uncanonical writings also, with one notable exception.⁸² Several quotations will suffice. Concerning the Messiah of the tribe of Judah, a first century B. C. insertion⁸³ in the Testaments of the XII Patriarchs, Judah 24:5, 6, declares:

"And the sceptre of my kingdom shall shine forth; and from your root shall arise a stem, and from it shall grow up a rod of righteousness unto the Gentiles, to judge and to save all that call upon the Lord."

In reference to the New Jerusalem Tob. 13:11 (Cod. \mathfrak{A}) affirms:

"A bright light shall shine unto all the ends of the earth; many nations shall come from afar, and the inhabitants of the utmost ends of the earth unto Thy holy name; with their gifts also in their hands unto the King of heaven, generations of generations shall utter rejoicing in thee, and Thy name that is elect unto the generations of eternity." Cf. 14:6, 7.

In reference to the Son of Man "The Similitudes" have:

"He shall be a staff to the righteous whereon to stay themselves and not fall, and he shall be the light of the Gentiles. All who dwell on earth shall fall down and worship before him and shall praise and bless and celebrate with song the Lord of Spirits" (I Enoch 48:4, 5).

Whereas these visions reflect no activity on the part of Judaism to redeem the heathen, there is no doubt that the doors of Israel were opened to converts. The book of Ruth would indicate that about the time of Ezra and Nehemiah Israel contemplated the reception of proselytes. On the first page of the

82. Ben-Sira, a devout though not strictly orthodox Jew, makes the following comment: "An honourable race is what? The race of men..." (Ecclus. 10:19). This verse is not extant in Hebrew. But verse 22 which reflects similar breadth of spirit is. "Sojourner and stranger, foreigner and poor man, their glory is the fear of God."

83. See R. H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, vol. 2, p. 290.

book are the words, "Thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God" (1:16). That there were proselytes is indicated by Is. 56. "Neither let the foreigner, who hath joined himself to Yahweh, speak, saying, Yahweh will surely separate me from His people" (verse 3; cf. verse 6).⁸⁴

Judaism continued to attract converts well down into the Christian era.⁸⁵ With obvious pride Josephus repeatedly refers to Gentiles who were favorably disposed toward Judaism: 1) many converts in the vicinity of Antioch,⁸⁶ 2) women of Damascus inclined toward Judaism,⁸⁷ 3) the conversion of the royal family of Adiabene and the loyalty of the Adiabenes in the revolt against Rome,⁸⁸ 4) the favorable disposition of Poppaea, Nero's wife,⁸⁹ 5) loyal and apostate Greek converts,⁹⁰ 6) an almost universal observance of the Sabbath and other Jewish ceremonials in most cities,⁹¹ and 7) semi-converts in Syria,⁹² Egypt and Cyrene.⁹³ Hellenistic Judaism was more successful in attracting Gentiles than was Pharisaic Judaism.⁹⁴ Mass conversions were unknown, except in the forced conversion of the Idumeans by John Hyrcanus and of Iturea by Aristobulus in which political expedience rather than religious fanaticism was the motive. Converts came singly.

84. A. C. Welch considered Ps. 135 to be a liturgical hymn for a festival such as the Passover, with special reference to men who then became proselytes (op. cit., pp. 55f.).

85. Her success was great enough to arouse Roman antagonism.

86. War vii. 3. 30.

87. Ibid., ii., 20, 2.

88. Ant. xvi. 20. 2-4; War ii. 19. 2; vi. 6. 4.

89. Ant. xx. 8. 11. It is improbable that Poppaea was a convert.

90. C. Apionem, ii. 10.

91. Ibid., ii. 39.

92. War ii. 18. 2.

93. Ant. xiv. 7. 2.

94. Schurer lists a number of reasons for the greater success of Hellenistic Judaism (History of the Jewish People, vol. 2, 297-311).



52

Israel did not send out missionaries into the partes infidelium expressly to proselyte the heathen.⁹⁵ In Jewish literature it is only in the book of Jonah that we encounter the dynamic necessary for missionary dedication. Recognizing the oneness of God and His love, the author concludes that "it is not so much the glory of God that demands that men of every race should be brought into His kingdom, as the love of God that yearns to reveal His Grace to all men."⁹⁶ However, the book of Jonah is a satire against the official attitude of Judaism, and not an expression of it. Gentiles were attracted to Judaism by its literature, its schools, and especially by the example of moral stability and piety in the Jewish community.⁹⁷ Behind Israel's reception of proselytes "was the genuine desire to make the world one in the worship of the true God."⁹⁸

Yet, in spite of its principle of universalism Judaism was restricted by historical limitations of nationality.⁹⁹ Salvation was always conceived as attachment to the people of God's special choice.¹⁰⁰ And Judaism was nowhere a purely religious community. Religion was the means of preserving the peculiarity of the race. The Torah, the basis of the religion, became the guarantee also

95. W. G. Braude, Jewish Proselyting in the First Five Centuries of the Common Era, p. 8. Mt. 23:15 would seem to refer to sectarian zeal rather than to missionary zeal.

96. Rowley, op. cit., p. 33.

97. Braude, op. cit., p. 32. Cf. Bamberger, Proselytism in the Talmudic Period, p. 21.

98. Braude, op. cit., pp. 4 and 8.

99. Cf. Bousset, Religion des Judentums, 2nd ed., pp. 100ff. cf. Bamberger, op. cit., p. 3.

100. Cf. Hebert, Throne of David, pp. 74ff.

of the cultural ethos. It not only demanded devotion and high moral action, but it also demanded circumcision of males, forbade social relations with the uncircumcised, and regulated the diet and Sabbath observance.¹⁰¹ The convert to Judaism was required to submit to these regulations.¹⁰² And the initiatory rites into Judaism -- baptism for all proselytes and circumcision for the males -- had, as George Foot Moore pointed out, the significance not so much of "entrance into a religious community" as "naturalization in the Jewish race."¹⁰³ Most Gentiles who were attracted by the moral stability and piety of the Jewish community remained outside the synagogue society proper. There were far more *σεβόμενοι* or *φοβούμενοι* than proselytes.¹⁰⁴

101. See Bousset, *op. cit.*, pp. 141ff.

102. The indispensable requirements for conversion were acceptance of the whole Torah, circumcision of males, baptism, and sacrifice. See Bamberger, *op. cit.*, pp. 31 and 42ff.

103. *Judaism*, p. 232.

104. Moore, *op. cit.*, pp. 232f.; Bousset, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

CHAPTER III: THE BIAS OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS: CHRISTIANITY, AN INDEPENDENT AND UNIVERSAL FAITH

Any attempt to apprehend the teaching of Jesus must consider the complex literary relations of the materials contained in the gospels. Indubitably the editorial activities of the evangelists and of the compilers of the sources have affected material in the gospels.¹ The step undertaken in this chapter is to discover in so far as possible the bias of the evangelist in each of the synoptic gospels as it relates to the Gentile mission.²

A. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK

T. W. Manson detects two types of primary gospel-writing in the early Church: 1) lectionary -- for edification of the existing Christian community -- and 2) apologetic -- primarily for instructing the outsider.³ The obvious purpose of Mark was to enlighten converts and to satisfy a natural curiosity as regards the origins of Christianity. It was intended as a biography of practical religious value for the Christian reader.⁴ The motive of the evangelist, however, was primarily neither biographical nor historical. John Mark⁵ "screibt aus seinem Glauben heraus für den Glauben, ihn zu erwecken, zu stärken oder zu klären."⁶ He was concerned "with Jesus as the Messiah who represented the Kingdom of God."⁷

That his gospel is a product of the Gentile wing of the Church

1. Form critics, of course, contend that part of the material was created.

2. The bias of the sources will be noted in subsequent chapters.

3. The Life of Jesus: A Survey of the Available Material: The Work of St. Luke (Reprint from Ryl. Bul., XXVIII, no. 2), p. 12.

4. Cf. B. H. Branscomb, Mark (Moffatt), pp. xviii f.

5. Canon Streeter has pointed out that the burden of proof is on those who would deny the tradition that the oldest gospel was written by Mark (The Four Gospels, p. 562).

6. J. Weiss, Das älteste Evangelium, p. 41.

7. E. F. Scott, The Literature of the New Testament, p. 63.

is beyond dispute. Its literary genre belongs to the Graeco-Roman world. Canon Streeter noted: "Jewish religious tradition, while treasuring with utmost care the words of a great teacher, was strangely indifferent to the biographical interest."⁸ On the other hand, the intense interest of the Greeks and the Romans in biography, especially in this period, is attested by the names of Plutarch, Suetonius, and Tacitus. Burkitt has called attention to the originality of Mark as the inventor of the biographical type of gospel.⁹ Moreover, early tradition connected the gospel with the Gentile church.¹⁰ Further, the internal evidence of the book implies that it was written for Gentile Christians. The evangelist explains Jewish customs and terms,¹¹ translates all Aramaic phrases,¹² in two instances shows either a glaring lack of interest in or a lack of knowledge of Palestinian conditions,¹³ and is apparently unfamiliar with the geography of the country.¹⁴ Whether its provenance was Rome, which is probable,¹⁵ or some other Gentile center, is incidental to the purpose of this study. It dates ca. A. D. 65.

8. Op. cit., p. 496.

9. Earliest Sources of the Life of Jesus, p. 128.

10. Papias, Eus. H. E., III, 39, 15; Irenaeus, H. E., V, 8, 3; cf. Clement of Alexandria, H. E., VI, 14, 5; Jerome, Comm. in Mattheum Proemium, 6.

11. 7:3, 4; 15:42. 12. 6:41; 7:11; 7:34; 15:34. 13. 7:3f.; 10:12.

14. See Bacon, The Gospel of Mark, pp. 303f.

15. So Bacon, Is Mark a Roman Gospel? Cf. A. M. Hunter, The Gospel according to St. Mark, p. 18. Bacon reached this conclusion through consideration of the tradition of Papias (ca. A. D. 150), of the early wide dissemination of the gospel, and of internal evidence including alleged Paulinism. The only other claimant as the provenance of Mark is Alexandria. Its claim is manifestly late.

16. Vide Hunter, op. cit., p. 18; Rawlinson, St. Mark, ad. loc. T. W. Manson, who affirms that ἐξ ὧς in Irenaeus does not necessarily mean that Peter was dead before Mark ~~was~~ wrote, would date the Gospel as early as A. D. 58. See op. cit., The Work of St. Mark (Reprint from Ryl. Bul., XXVIII, no. 1), p. 20.

The gospel indubitably represents "das Bewusstsein der damaligen Heidenkirche."¹⁷ M. Werner has pointed out that the question whether Mark represented the universal principle "zu bejahen ist, steht ausser allem Zweife." The only question is "in welcher Form und in welchem Grade?"¹⁸

The gospel quite apparently represented Jesus a) as setting aside the claims of Jewishness and b) as heralding the Christian mission to the Gentiles.

1) Mark exhibits no Judaistic leanings or Law-bound anxieties. The evangelist set the authority of Jesus above that of the Torah: "The Son of Man is lord even of the Sabbath."¹⁹ He perceived the teaching of Jesus as transcending Jewish laws, e.g. those regarding fasting, Sabbath observance, divorce. His comment at 7:19, "Thus he made all foods clean," indicates that he considered Jesus to have abrogated the Jewish food laws.²⁰ Elsewhere he applies the parables of the old and new (2:21-22) so as to indicate that the forms of Judaism are outmoded. "The ministry of Jesus is not to be regarded as an attempt to reform Judaism; it brings something entirely new, which cannot be accommodated to the traditional system."²¹

Likewise the evangelist denies the special privileges of the Jewish nation. That people have forfeited these privileges by their refusal of the Messiah. Though not elaborated as in the

17. Feine, Jesus Christus und Paulus, p. 140.

18. Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium, 197.

19. 2:18. Whether or not Jesus referred to Himself as "the Son of Man" at this stage in His ministry, Mark understood "Son of Man" to be a Messianic reference here.

20. Cf. Branscomb, op. cit., p. 128.

21. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, p. 117.

later gospels, this conviction is clear. In the critical hours of the trial when Jews and Gentiles united to bring about the death of the Messiah, it is the chief priests and in lesser degree the scribes and the Jewish multitude who carry the primary responsibility. Pilate is not exonerated, but his part consists simply in carrying out the wishes of the bloodthirsty Jewish leaders. It is specifically stated that Pilate "perceived that for envy the chief priests had delivered Him up" (15:10). Of the spectators at the foot of the cross the chief priests and scribes mocked Him among themselves. The moral of all this is pointed in the parable of the wicked husbandmen (12:1-12). With the rejection of Jesus, the ethnic privileges of the Jews had ceased.²²

2) The Marcan narrative contains several intimations of the Gentile mission. A notable feature in this respect is the dearth of references to the Gentile. The word ethnos appears in only five contexts:

i. In Jesus' third announcement of His impending suffering:

"Behold, we are going up to Jerusalem, and the Son of Man will be delivered to the chief priests and scribes, and they will condemn Him to death and deliver Him to the ἔθνη, and they will mock Him and spit upon Him and kill Him" (10:33f.).

ii. In His characterization of Christian greatness:

"And Jesus called them to Him and said to them: You know that they who are supposed to rule over the ἔθνη lord it over them, and their great men exercise authority over them. But it shall not be so among you; but who ever would be first among you must be your servant" (10:42-43).

iii. In His cleansing of the Temple:

"And He taught and said to them, Is it not written, My

22. Cf. Rawlinson, op. cit., ad. loc.

House shall be called a house of prayer for all the
 ἑθνεστί? But you have made it a den of thieves"
 (11:17, quoting Is. 56:7).

iv. In His characterization of the omen of the Parousia:

"For ἑθνος will rise up against ἑθνος, and kingdom
 against kingdom,..." (13:8).

v. In His warning of the beginning of trouble:

"And to all the ἑθνη the gospel must first be preached"
 (13:10).²³

Concerning the evangelist's use of the term ethnos two conclusions
 may be drawn. a) Even as he had been outside the Old, the ethnos
 stands outside the Christian dispensation. He is indicted for
 having a part in the execution of Jesus and for holding false
 standards of greatness. (See nos. i and ii.) b) But the ethnos
 must receive the proclamation of the Gospel. (See nos. iii and
 v.).

The word Ἑλληνίς appears at 7:26, identifying the woman
 suppliant of 7:24-30 as a Greek, Συροφονικήσα τῷ γένει.
 Here only can we be wholly certain that Mark is depicting Jesus
 ministering to a Gentile.²⁴ Several points in the Marcan interpre-
 tation of this episode are clear. a) Jesus did not enter the region
 of Tyre and Sidon to conduct a ministry among the Gentiles. Mark
 indicates this fact in two ways. i. The purpose of Jesus' visit
 is implied in the sentence, οὐδένα ἠθέλησεν γινῶκε, καὶ οὐκ

23. E. Klostermann (Das Marcus Evangelium, p. 134) and Cadbury
 (The Making of Luke-Acts, p. 255, fn. 1) question the authenticity
 of the second half of this verse on the ground that it appears in
 neither of the parallel passages (Lk. 21:13; Mt. 10:8). The first
 half of the verse is then read as part of the preceding sentence:
 ... εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἑθνη; the second half
 discarded as non-Markan. Against this view is the awkwardness of
 the emended text (supra) and the re-appearance of the full content
 of the verse at Mt. 24:13. These considerations lead me to retain
 13:10 as Marcan.

24. For possible encounters, see, below, pp. 60ff.

ἡδυνάσθη λαθεῖν.²⁵ Jesus sought quiet and privacy for Himself and His disciples in this region²⁶ in order simply to escape the thronging of the populace,²⁷ or else to explain a teaching to His disciples.²⁸ ii. Jesus' initial refusal of the woman's request is in itself conclusive evidence that He did not seek to conduct a mission among the Gentiles.

b) His ministry to the Gentile was unique and incidental and not the beginning of a ministry to the Gentiles.²⁹ The evangelist reports that when Jesus eventually acceded to the woman's request He simply said, "For this saying you may go your way; the demon has left your daughter" (7:29). The exorcism is accomplished without a visit to the little girl. There is no announcement of a new arrangement for the Gentiles or of an intention on the part of Jesus to work among Gentiles. And the subsequent narrative of our Lord's ministry in the Decapolis (where He may very well have ministered to Gentiles³⁰) has the character of mere contingency to and not consequence upon this particular incident. "Soon after this He returned from the region of Tyre, and went through Sidon to the sea of Galilee, through the region of the Decapolis" (7:31).

c) This event is a prophetic foreshadowing of the later Church mission to the Gentiles.³¹ Mark's account of Jesus' initial

25. Following the text of A. Huck, Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien (1910), p. 94.

26. This fact would tend to refute Volkmar's contention that this incident was connected with the preceding controversy regarding clean and unclean, that the home into which Jesus entered was a Gentile one, and that He entered this home in order to show that He saw "darin keine Verunreinigung" (Die Evangelien, pp. 384ff.). Cf. Werner, op. cit.

27. Note the relation between 2:1 and 1:45; cf. 9:30.

28. See 7:17; 9:28; 9:33, 10:10.

29. But see J. Weiss, op. cit., p. 84.

30. See p. 61, below.

31. Cf. Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 98.

refusal of the woman's request anticipates the Great Commission.³² Verse 27 categorically denies the woman's request. The time for a ministry to the Gentiles has not yet arrived. But the word $\pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\nu$ implies that such a ministry is to come. Compare Rom. 1:16, where the era of the $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\eta\nu$ has come. A further hint of the subsequent Gentile mission may be found in the manner of the cure. Compare the healing of the centurion's servant (Lk. 7:1-10/Mt. 8:5-13). Healing from a distance appears to have augured for the evangelists a subsequent ministry which was more direct and personal.³³

Mark narrates other events in which some have thought that they detected reference to a ministry of Jesus to the Gentiles. Three of these incidents deserve notice.

a) Volkmar perceived at 3:8 a multitude of Gentiles who "als Proselyten kommen."³⁴ However, it is altogether improbable that the evangelist intended to depict here "eine Tätigkeit Jesus unter den Heiden."³⁵ Our Lord's withdrawal to this region was due to the opposition of both religious and political authorities (3:6). The obvious implication of the whole passage (3:7ff.) is that the ministry of Jesus had been in progress long enough for His fame as a worker-of-miracles to spread far and wide throughout the whole land. And although it is not impossible that Gentiles were in the group who were attracted to Him at this time, the reference to Galilee, Perea, Idumea, etc., is only to regions of Palestine³⁶ "in denen Juden wohnten."

32. Note the opinion of many scholars (e.g., Branscomb, Jesus and the Law of Moses, p. 87) that the lost end of Mark contained a form of the Great Commission.

33. Cf. J. Warschauer, The Historical Life of Jesus, p. 190.

34. Op. cit., p. 384.

35. Werner, op. cit., p. 198;

36. J. Wellhausen, Das Evangelium Marci, p. 22.

b) There is little basis for thinking that the episode at 5:1-20 involved Gentiles. Gerasa³⁷ was a half-heathen country, and none but a Gentile or a very lax Jew would either own or herd swine, which have always been unclean animals to the orthodox Jew. Mark, however, could hardly have considered the Gerasenes to be Gentiles, when 7:24-30 follows.³⁸

c) J. Weiss insisted that the events reported at 7:31ff. took place on pagan soil and that the people involved were Gentiles.³⁹ In support of this thesis it can be urged that the Decapolis was composed of cities of Greek architecture and culture in which Gentile population abounded and Gentile religion flourished.⁴⁰ On the other hand, it must be noted that Judaism was a vital faith in the Decapolis. These Greek cities were ^{home} to Jews "en assez grand nombre."⁴¹ Thus the greatest consideration must be given to the internal evidence of the passage. And here we have two pertinent facts. i. The phraseology of the request, ἐπιθῆ αὐτῷ τὴν χεῖρα, is Semitic in form.⁴² ii. The reported healing word, ἐφφαθά, is Aramaic.⁴³ These facts are most intelligible if the supplicants were Jews. It would seem that Mark understood Jesus to be working among His own people here.

Two conclusions may be drawn from the above. First, the evangelist understood that the proclamation of the Gospel would

37. Mark's identification of the setting as Gerasa may have been due entirely to his ignorance of Palestinian geography. Matthew places the event in Gadara (8:28). But probability favors little known Gergesa (Luke 8:26).

38. Cf. J. Weiss, *op. cit.*, p. 83.

39. *Ibid.*, pp. 83-84.

40. Filson and Wright, *The Westminster Atlas to the Bible*, *ad. loc.*

41. Lagrange, *Saint Marc*, p. 187.

42. *Ibid.*

43. Represents פהח, the ethpa'el imperative of the verb פהח (Hebrew פהח).

bring all nations within the scope of the Divine Kingdom. This is characteristically set forth in the parable of the mustard seed (4:31f.), where the small beginnings of the Kingdom are contrasted with its rapid growth, which will ultimately shadow the world.⁴⁴ Compare 14:9 and note 13:10, quoted above. For Mark the religion.⁴⁵

Second, Mark did not consider it necessary to base the Gentile mission on the example of Jesus. He of course knew the universal tradition, *Χριστὸν διὰ κόνον γεγενῆσθαι περιτομῆς ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας Θεοῦ* (Rom. 15:8). The ministry of Jesus furnished only foreshadowings of the subsequent mission to the Gentiles. See 7:27, cited above.⁴⁶ This fact is also graphically set forth at 15:39. Mark reports that the centurion exclaimed at the death of Jesus, *ἀληθῶς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος υἱὸς ἦν Θεοῦ*. It would seem that the editor referred this utterance to the whole demeanor of Jesus upon the cross. The phrase, *υἱὸς Θεοῦ*, offers a minor difficulty to ascertaining the Marcan interpretation of the centurion's profession. Ordinarily this phrase translates "a son of God."⁴⁷ And some scholars have urged that the centurion's utterance was only a heathen acknowledgment of the extraordinarily heroic character of Jesus.⁴⁸ Such is the obvious meaning of the Lucan account of the statement, *ὁὗτως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν* (23:47). The Marcan narrative, however, manifestly apprehends a more significant pro-

44. Cf. Rawlinson, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

45. Cf. A. Julicher, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 321ff.

46. It is not impossible that the feeding of the 4000 was understood by Mark to be a promise of the "bread" to the Gentiles. Cf. Rawlinson, *op. cit.*, *ad. loc.*

47. Nonetheless, B D L read *υἱὸς Θεοῦ* at Mk. 1:1, where the translation "a son of God" is impossible.

48. E.g. Holtzmann, *Synoptiker*, p. 294; Gould, *St. Mark*, *ad. loc.*

fession. The terms used by Mark, *κεντυρίων, ἐξέπνευσεν, εἶπεν, υἱὸς θεοῦ*, are quite distinct from those used by Luke, *ἐκατοντάρχης, ἐδόξαζεν, λέγων, δίκαιος*. Mark's terms "sont choisis dans l'esprit de tout son évangile qui est d'amener à confesser que Jesus est Fils de Dieu."⁴⁹ The Marcan narrative of the centurion at the cross has a definitive purpose. In the words of J. Weiss it is: "Der Centurio spricht als Typus aller derer, die aus der Heidenwelt herbeikommen werden und unter dem Eindrucke des Kreuzestodes Jesus zum Glauben an den Sohn Gottes gelangen."⁵⁰

B. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE

After Nero's savage attack on the Christian community in A. D. 64, the need for a Christian apologetic was keenly felt in the Church. The Roman world in its hostility to new ideas must be shown that the religion of Christ is in no way seditious propaganda, but is the fulfillment of the ancient prophecies of God. The Jewish wars of A. D. 66-70 necessitated that the Christian Church should also demonstrate its distinctness from Judaism. For this task Luke,⁵¹ a companion of Paul, brought together the traditions of Rome (Mark), Antioch (Q), and Caesarea (L). His gospel was apparently designed to reach members of the Roman aristocracy; it was addressed to one of high position, *κράτιστε*,⁵² and its style would jar less on the literary taste of the educated classes than did that of Mark. Luke completed his gospel probably about

49. Lagrange, *op. cit.*, p. 409.

50. *Op. cit.*, p. 88.

51. Tradition ascribes the third gospel to Luke. Streeter has demonstrated in an effective way that the burden of proof is on those who deny this tradition (*op. cit.*, p. 562).

52. Aptly rendered "Your Excellence" by Streeter (*op. cit.*, p. 539).

84

A. D. 75,⁵³ possibly in Achaea.⁵⁴

There are two general indications that this evangelist meant to depict Jesus as a self-conscious world-saviour and Christianity as a world-religion.

First, though ignoring incidents in the conflict between the ministry of Jesus and the Jewish ceremonial law, Luke makes it clear that the former transcends the latter.

Montefiore among others has noted that the universalism of Luke has no polemic tinge. The evangelist did not record the controversies over the failure of the disciples to wash their hands before eating (Mk. 7:1-23) and over divorce (Mk. 10:1-12), in which the sharpest attacks of Jesus on legalistic Judaism are reported. Moreover, Luke preferred the Q record of the Great Commandment, in which Jesus merely condoned the noble insight of contemporary Judaism and failed to say, "There is none other commandment greater than these" (Mk. 12:31).⁵⁵ Nonetheless, Luke reported that Jesus set aside definite Jewish laws -- e.g. the Sabbath laws, 6:1-11, 14:1-6. In setting forth his own point of view the evangelist affirmed that the Christian revelation excels previous revelations (16:16) and that the Christian obligation calls for

53. The passage 21:20-24 necessitates a date after the destruction of the Temple in A. D. 70. Luke was probably using a tradition which was prior to the event (see T. W. Manson, The Mission and Message of Jesus, pp. 62lf.; V. Taylor, Behind the Third Gospel, ad. loc.). Yet, the language of Luke echoes incidents which took place -- e. g. at v. 21 the retreat of Christians from Jerusalem to Pella in the words *καὶ ὁ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς ἐκχρεΐσθαι* -- in such realistic fashion as to secure the judgment that Luke was writing post de facto (cf. Creed, The Gospel according to St. Luke, pp. 25f.; W. Manson, Luke, ad. loc). The apologetic aim of the writing would suggest a date not long after A. D. 70. See T. W. Manson, The Life of Jesus: A Survey of the Available Material: the Work of St. Luke (Reprint from Ryl. Bul., XXVIII, no. 2, 1944).

54. So the anti-Marcionite prologue. See T. W. Manson, op. cit., pp. 5f., 24.

55. These facts seem best explained by the Proto-Luke hypothesis. See Streeter, op. cit. and V. Taylor, op. cit.

an obedience which is not consonant with mere outward conformity to the law (11:40f.).

Because the distinctness of the Christian revelation was so clear to him, Luke could see in bold relief the crisis which the appearance of Jesus presented to contemporary Judaism. Thrusting the narrative of Mk. 6:1ff. back to the beginning of our Lord's Galilean ministry, the evangelist used it as a foundation for a representative and symbolic scene (4:16-30). Jesus preaches in the synagogue at Nazareth. Although impressed with His words, His auditors take offence at His wisdom. Our Lord retorts, "No prophet is acceptable in his own country." Then His audience becomes enraged at His reference to ministries by prophet to Gentiles. He escapes a precipitate death.⁵⁶ Israel is confronted with the ἐπισκοπή (ἡγεμονία) of God.⁵⁷

The evangelist underscores the indifference of Judaism to Jesus. The invited guests decline to come to the Messianic Banquet (14:15ff.). The religious leaders bring to a climax their rejection of the messengers of God by killing His Son (20:9ff.).

Because of the rejection of Jesus the ethnic privileges of Israel have ceased. Others will take precedence over the Jews in the Kingdom because the Jews "thrust out" themselves (13:28ff.). "For I tell you, none of those men who were invited shall taste my banquet" (14:24). The rejection of Judaism is reiterated in the parable of the wicked husbandmen (20:9ff.). To the Marcan tradition, "He (God) will come and destroy these tenants, and give

56. See Creed, op. cit., p. 65; W. Manson, op. cit., p. 41.

57. Cf. T. W. Manson, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 613.

the vineyard to others," Luke adds, "When they (i.e. the people) heard this, they said, God forbid!"

Second, Luke characteristically proclaims the universal character of Jesus' ministry.

This evangelist is described as pre-eminently the Gentile historian. Indicative of his interest in the Gentiles is his frequent use of the word ethnos. Ethnos which occurs six times in Mark appears twelve times in the third gospel, even though Lk. 19:46 omits "for all ἐθνῶν" (cf. Mk. 11:17)⁵⁸ and Lk. 21:13 (although indicating the triumphant progress of the Gospel) does not follow Mk. 13:10 in using the term ethnos.⁵⁹ In one passage (7:5) the term refers to Israel. It is taken over from Mark in the following passages:

- i. Jesus' third announcement of His impending sufferings:
"For he will be delivered to the ἐθνῶν ..." (18:32).
- ii. Signs of the Parousia:
"ἐθνῶς will rise up against ἐθνος..." (21:10).
- iii. Order of precedence in the Kingdom of God:
"The kings of the ἐθνῶν exercise lordship over them..." (22:25).

It is found in one Q passage: Of concern and treasure:

"For all the ἐθνη of the world seek these things; and your Father knows that you need them" (12:3).

58. Luke's omission seems deliberate and due, if our dating is correct, to the fact that the Temple had fallen and the nations of the world were finding their way into the Church -- not into the Temple of the old order. Cf. Creed, op. cit., p. 242. Prof. W. Manson suggests that the evangelist has centered his attention momentarily "on the national aspects of the reform carried through by Jesus" (op. cit., p. 219).

59. Luke at this point is using his Palestinian source, L.

Luke incorporates it from his special sources in the following contexts:

i. The Nunc Dimittis:

"A light for revelation to the ^{ἔθνη}
And for glory to thy people Israel" (2:32).

ii. The oppression of Judea:

"They shall fall by the edge of the sword, and be
led captive among all the ^{ἔθνη}; and Jerusalem
will be trodden down of the ^{ἔθνη}, until the
times of the ^{ἔθνη} are fulfilled" (21:24).

iii. The coming of the Son of Man:

"And there will be signs in the sun and moon and
stars, and upon the earth distress of the ^{ἔθνη}..."
(21:25).

iv. The Resurrection Appearance in Jerusalem:

"And that repentance and forgiveness of sins should
be preached in His name to all ^{ἔθνη}..." (24:47).

Conclusions which may be drawn safely from these contexts reveal how pointedly Luke depicted Christianity as a world-religion. 1) This evangelist, even as Mark, contrasted the Gentile with the Christian. In fact the contrast is more fully delineated by Luke. Not only was the ethnos a party to the murder of Jesus and has a false sense of greatness and is concerned exclusively with material things, but the impression at 21:24 is that the ^{ἔθνη} are satanic forces who are having their hour.⁶⁰ They will have cause for distress at the Parousia. 2) at the same time the evangelist affirms that the Christian mission to the Gentiles is not merely right but mandatory. The high mission of Jesus included being a revelation to the Gentiles. The Resurrected Christ explicitly com-

60. But see footnote 61, below, p. 69.

manded His disciples to proclaim the Gospel to all nations. *καὶ πᾶσι ἔθνεσιν* (21:24) may include the thought of Romans 11:25 and refer to the era of the Gentile opportunity to enter the Kingdom of God.⁶¹ Such was the thought of Mark (13:10), and the eschatological motive is present to Luke elsewhere (13:25-27).

The Lucan interest in the Gentile mission is apparent in other passages. Luke characteristically points out the universal purpose of Divine Redemption. The Lucan genealogy which is carried back to Adam (3:23-28), in contrast to the Matthean which goes back only to Abraham, suggests the organic unity of Jesus with all humanity.⁶² His record of the vox clamantis prophecy (3:4ff.) is carried on, in contrast to that of both Mark and Matthew, to include the promise "All flesh shall see the salvation of God."⁶³ He reports a mission of seventy⁶⁴ disciples -- a doublet of the mission of the twelve -- representing the seventy nations of the world.⁶⁵

The universal mission, for Luke, was not a mere consequence of the ministry of Jesus. Nor was it based on the example of Jesus. Luke makes no report of Jesus' being on Gentile soil. He omits the Syrophoenician incident probably because it suggested too much the inferior position of the Gentiles.⁶⁶ Luke indicates that Jesus Himself anticipated and commanded the universal mission. He welcomed with high praise the faith of the Roman centurion (7:9).

61. Cf. Creed, op. cit., p. 257; T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 623.

62. Cf. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 35; Streeter, op. cit., p. 220.

63. Cadbury is not impressed by this and points out that Luke stops short of the words "for all nations" in quoting from Mk. 11:17 (op. cit., p. 254). But see footnote 58, p. 67, above.

64. The Sahidic and Old Syriac MSS read "seventy-two."

65. Cf. Creed, op. cit., p. 144.

66. Cf. Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 99.

Compare 17:18, where Luke uses the term *ἀλλογενής* with reference to the grateful Samaritan, thus indicating that Gentiles have the capacity to receive and appreciate the blessings of the Kingdom.⁶⁷ Jesus proclaimed that Gentiles ("men ... from east and west, and from north and south") will take precedence over ("will be first") Jews ("will be last") in the Kingdom of God.⁶⁸ Compare *πᾶς* (16:16; contrast "men of violence" at Mt. 11:12) enter the Kingdom.⁶⁹ Our Lord instructed His disciples to be a "light" to those entering the faith (11:33; contrast Mt. 5:15, where Christians are to be a light to those already in the "house").⁷⁰ Compare 14:23, which has no parallel in the Matthean parable. The commission (unfulfilled as the parable closes) to extend the invitation to the Messianic Banquet to the denizens of the "highways and hedges" can only refer to an obligatory mission to the Gentile world.⁷¹

The Lucan point of view receives its characteristic expression in the narrative of the Roman centurion (7:1-10). Several features are unique to the Lucan story. Jesus and the centurion never meet. Two groups of emissaries confront Jesus on the centurion's behalf. The first delegation are Jews who make (for the centurion) his request that his servant be healed and commend him as a patron of Judaism. The second group are "friends" who bear the message which deters Jesus from entering the home of the cen-

67. The word "foreigner" includes Gentile; cf. Creed, op. cit., ad. loc.
 68. Ibid., p. 186.
 69. Ibid., p. 207.
 70. 13:25-28. See Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, ad. loc.; cf. B. T. D. Smith, The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels, Ad. loc.
 71. Cf. B. S. Easton, The Gospel according to St. Luke, p. 229; W. Manson, op. cit., p. 179.

turion. The special construction which Luke places on the incident has the obvious purpose of keeping Jesus and the centurion from meeting. (Contrast the Matthean story.) The centurion thus acquires a symbolic character typifying later believers among the Gentiles who though never meeting Jesus benefit, nonetheless, from His ministry through the witness of others.⁷²

C. THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MATTHEW

The Gospel according to St. Matthew is in some respects the most interesting of the gospels for our study. It is the most "Jewish" and, at the same time, the most catholic of the synoptic gospels.

Conclusions regarding the provenance of this gospel are so inseparable from judgment about its purpose that the former can not be stated without some prior reference to the latter. In judging the purpose of the Matthean gospel one must, without neglecting the catholicity of the gospel, concentrate attention upon its Jewishness.

Critical scholarship has reached several significant conclusions about this Jewishness. Three of these conclusions require only to be stated here. 1) This Jewishness is not to be equated with "original" but is rather akin to the Rabbinism which developed its program at Jamnia after A. D. 70 and subsequently dominated Judaism.⁷³ 2) The bias toward the Jews is found in the

72. Cf. Creed, op. cit., p. 100.

73. See G. D. Kilpatrick, The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, pp. 106f. Montefiore has termed Matthew the gospel "most closely in touch with the Talmud" (The Synoptic Gospels, vol. 1, pp. livf.). Canon Streeter has a clear summary statement about the priority of Mark. 1) Matthew reproduces 90% of the subject matter of Mark in language very largely identical with that of Mark; (cont.)

material peculiar to Matthew.⁷⁴ 3) Editorial activity at numerous points creates the Jewish cast.⁷⁵

Luke does the same for rather more than half of Mark. 2) In any average section which occurs in the three gospels the majority of the actual words used by Mark are reproduced by Matthew and Luke, either alternately or both together. 3) The relative order of the events and sections in Mark is in general supported by both Matthew and Luke; where either of them deserts Mark the other is usually found supporting him. In addition to these reasons from content, wording, and order, Streeter shows that the primitive character of Mark as respects both form and content and the distribution of Marcan and non-Marcan material in both Matthew and Luke "looks as though each had before him the Marcan material in a single document" (The Four Gospels, pp. 151f.).

74. This material is strongly impressed with the limitation of the ministry of Jesus to the Jews. The genealogy (1:1-17) asserts only the noble descent of Jesus from the royal house of David and from Abraham -- the name given to Abram when the national privileges began in the covenant of circumcision (Gen. 17). Contrast the Lucan genealogy. The M saying at 7:6 has Jesus expressing extreme contempt toward Gentiles. Two M sayings (10:5f.; 15:24) tend to dogmatize the restriction of the Gospel proclamation to the Jews. The ministry of Jesus and that of His disciples was to be a light to those already within the faith (5:14f.).

75. The addition of the words, *παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας* at 5:32 and 19:19 conforms the Q saying on divorce (Lk. 16:18) to Jewish practices. Addition of the words, *μηδὲ σαββάτω* at 24:20, (cf. Mk. 13:18) heeds a Jewish custom. (For conditions which annul the Sabbath, see Judaism and Christianity, edited by E.I.J. Rosenthal, vol. 1, p. 172) The word, *ἁλισθῆσεται* at 5:13, corresponding to *ἁρτύσσετε* (Mk. 9:50) and *ἁρτυθήσεται* (Lk. 14:34), makes the passage concerning salt more Jewish. (Cf. T. B. Bechoroth 8b, quoted by Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, 2nd series, p. 183.). The insertion of the word, *δεξιός*, in a number of passages, e.g. 5:39 (cf. Lk. 6:29), gives them a Jewish flavor. (For the greater importance and value of the right member of a pair, see the Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. 10, under "Right and Left.") The definitely Jewish phrase *βασιλεία τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* replaces *βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ*. (The latter phrase is used exclusively by Mark and Luke, but occurs in only three or four contexts in Matthew. It appears at 12:28 (Q), 21:31 and 21:43 (both M). Manuscript evidence is divided about 19:24 (Mk.). The words used by Jesus, *ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δόξα*, are tantamount to the "sovereignty of God".

See G. Dalman, The Words of Jesus, pp. 91f. Kingdom of God seems to be original and Kingdom of Heaven imputed by Matthew. See J. Weiss, Die Predigt vom Reiche Gottes, p. 9.) A final example may be noted at 15:21-28, where Jesus is not allowed to enter Gentile territory and is depicted as giving expression to the most extreme form of Jewish bigotry against Gentiles. (See, below, chapter 7, pp. 168f., for the special construction placed upon this incident by Matthew.)

A fourth conclusion concerning this Jewishness demands more elaboration. Matthew was written primarily for people who were ethnically Jews. Evidence to this end is found in (a) the exclusive polemic against the Pharisees⁷⁶ and (b) the characteristic Matthean picture of Jesus as the fulfillment of the Torah (5:17-20) and as the new Law-Giver who is greater than Moses.⁷⁷ Either the gospel was edited only with the needs of a Jewish church in mind, or else it was produced not only to edify Jewish Christians but also to convince non-Christian Jews.

There can be no strong doubt that Matthew was written for a Jewish church. On the analogy of Mk. 10:12, where reference to divorce of her husband by the wife reflects the condition of the Graeco-Roman world, it is reasonable to conclude that at a later date and in a strongly Jewish church Jewish customs would adjust the sayings to contemporary Jewish ways.⁷⁸ There is further evidence for this thesis at 15:1f., where the evangelist omits explanation of the Jewish custom given at Mk. 7:3f.

No drastic exception can be taken to Kilpatrick's thesis that Matthew is a revised lectionary edition of Mark. Yet, there are considerations that create the strong impression that the editor also had apologetic purposes in mind.⁷⁹ First and foremost, there is the unmistakable emphasis on Jesus as the fulfillment of the

76. In Mark, Jesus is in contact with Pharisees, Sadducees, Herodians, and, preeminently, the *am ha-aretz*. In Matthew controversies with the Pharisees are highlighted to the virtual exclusion of the others. See further, Kilpatrick, *op. cit.*, pp. 106f.

77. Note especially the antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount and see B. W. Bacon, Studies in Matthew, pp. xv - xvii, who stresses the five-fold division of the gospel corresponding to the five books of Moses.

78. See Kilpatrick, *op. cit.*, pp. 101f.

79. See T. W. Manson, The Life of Jesus: A Survey of the Available Material: the Work of St. Matthew (Reprint from Ryl. Bul., XXIX, no. 2, 1946).

hopes of Israel. Incidentally at 2:3 the Magi seek him who was born king of the Jews. There are the M sayings (cited above, p. 71, fn. 74) which attach the work of Jesus and His disciples exclusively to the redemption of Israel. While this exclusiveness is mitigated in the gospel, its presence is significant.⁸⁰

Elsewhere apologia is obviously directed toward the Jews as well as against the Jewish controversialists. The Resurrection narrative includes the legends of the sealing of the tomb (27:62ff.) and the bribing of the Roman guards by the Jewish religious leaders (28:11ff.). More important is the Matthean picture of Jesus as the fulfillment of the Torah and as the new Law-Giver greater than Moses. Finally there is the fact that Matthew was apparently translated into Aramaic at an early date.⁸¹

We can now make conclusions regarding the provenance of the gospel. It was written in a Jewish church, but one outside of Palestine.⁸² Early tradition favors Antioch,⁸³ but a seaport in Phoenicia is more probable.⁸⁴ It first appeared ca. A. D. 85.⁸⁵

80. Streeter noted that Matthew represents a rapprochement between Judaistic and liberal Christian controversialists based on recognition of the possibility of the sayings of Jesus and not on a departure from the accepted record of them (op. cit., p. 518).

81. See T. W. Manson, op. cit.

82. Note its ignorance of Palestinian geography (Kilpatrick, p. 7).

83. See Streeter, op. cit., ad. loc.

84. See Kilpatrick, op. cit., ad. loc.

85. Kilpatrick's date, ca. A. D. 95, seems unnecessarily late. The terminus a quo is reached by two considerations. 1) its kinship to Rabbinism which dominated Judaism after A.D. 70 and 2) the passage 22:1-10, where verse 7 has apparently been rewritten to make explicit reference to the destruction of Jerusalem (cf. Luke 14:16-24 and see Bacon, op. cit., pp. 65f.). The terminus ad quem is indicated by its use in the Didache and probable knowledge of it by the authors of the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse (Streeter, op. cit., ad. loc.). T. W. Manson, in urging the thesis that Matthew was an apologia to the Jews, argues that it would appear in the same period in which Josephus' account of the Jewish wars appeared -- thus not much later than A. D. 80 (op. cit., pp. 22ff.).

It remains that the Jewish cast of Matthew in no way diminishes its thoroughly Christian essence. There is strong evidence that the evangelist considered Judaism to be ineffectual and Christianity to be universal in its character and mission.

First, Matthew reports the ineffectualness of Judaism. Our evangelist does not ignore the conflict between the ministry of Jesus and the ceremonial and ritual code of Judaism. Jesus set aside both the Sabbath laws and the legal concept of purity because God desires "mercy and not sacrifice" (12:7; 9:13). Indeed this conflict is graphically reported in the antithetical relationship between our Lord and the scribes. *ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν* Jesus is the Lord of the Sabbath (12:8) and the Law-Giver who is greater than Moses (see chapters 5-7). He judges the Torah and points out its peripheral injunctions (22:40). Indeed Jewish failure to receive Jesus has brought divine rejection of the nation Israel (21:43; 22:8). And so Christianity has displaced Judaism.⁸⁶

Second, Matthew states in clear terms the universal character of Christianity. There are numerous references to the Gentiles. The word ethnikos, except at III John 7, occurs in the New Testament only in this gospel. The term appears in the following contexts:

i. Of loving the enemy:

"And if you salute only your brethren, what more are you doing than others? Do not even the *ἔθνη* the same?" (5:47; cf. Lk. 6:34, *ἡμάρτολοι*).

ii. Concerning prayer:

"And in praying do not heap up empty phrases as the *ἔθνη* do;..." (6:7, M).

86. See 21:28-32, 33-43; 22:1-14, 14-30, 31-46.

iii. Duty of the brethren:

"And if he refuse to listen even to the church,
let him be to you as an ἔθνικός and a tax
collector" (18:17, M).

It is sufficient to note here that ethnikos has a derogatory suggestion.⁸⁷

The use of the word ethnos, however, is more significant. It occurs fourteen times in Matthew. It is taken over from Mark in the following passages:

i. The fate of the Twelve:

"And you will be dragged before governors and kings
for my sake, to bear testimony before them and the
ἔθνεσιν" (10:18).

ii. Jesus' second proclamation of His impending suffering:

"And deliver him to the ἔθνεσιν" (20:19).

iii. Jesus and the sons of Zebedee:

"You know that the rulers of the ἔθνων..." (20:25).

iv. The signs of the Parousia:

"For ἔθνος will rise up against ἔθνος..." (24:7).

v. Warnings of the beginning of the end:

"And this gospel of the Kingdom will be preached
throughout the whole world as a testimony to all
ἔθνεσιν ..." (24:14).

At another point the word is intruded into the Marcan context:

"You will be hated by all ἔθνων for my name's
sake ..." (24:9).

The term is found in only one Q passage:

"For the ἔθνη seek all these things,..." (6:32).

It is also found in what is probably an editorial comment on the

87. Cf. Kilpatrick, op. cit., p. 117.

parable of the wicked husbandmen:⁸⁸

"The kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to an $\epsilon\theta\nu\epsilon\iota$ producing the fruits of it" (21:43).

It occurs in one M passage (which was cited at footnote 74, above):

"Go nowhere among the $\epsilon\theta\nu\omega\nu$ " (10:5).

Further, the word appears in two Matthean quotations:

"Galilee of the $\epsilon\theta\nu\omega\nu$ " (4:15, quoting Is. 9:1, 2).

"And he shall proclaim justice to the $\epsilon\theta\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$...
And in his name will the $\epsilon\theta\nu\eta$ hope" (12:19, 21; quoting Is. 42:1ff.).

Finally and most important is the word from the Resurrection experience of the Church (the exact phrasing is probably due to the editor):⁸⁹

"Go therefore and make disciples of all $\epsilon\theta\nu\eta$..." (28:19).

The Matthean use of the term ethnos coincides with that of Mark and Luke. The ancient distinction between Israel and paganism has become the distinction between Christianity and the Gentile world. $\tau\alpha \epsilon\theta\nu\eta$ are, to begin with, outsiders. Compare the use of the term $\epsilon\theta\nu\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$. Yet, the mission to the Gentiles is accepted without reservation. Jesus came to fulfill the high mission of the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah, including the proclamation of mishpat to the Gentiles. The conversion of the Gentiles is a feature of the eschaton. The universal mission is mandatory.⁹⁰

The Matthean picture of the policy of Jesus corroborates these conclusions from the use of the term ethnos. The evangelist depicts Jesus in the early part of His ministry as espousing the

88. Cf. Kilpatrick, op. cit., p. 117.

89. Ibid., p. 49.

90. Ibid., p. 118.

extreme form of Jewish bigotry toward Gentiles.⁹¹ The Matthean mission charge prevents the disciples from leaving Jewish territory to go among Gentiles (10:5).⁹² ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς at 15:21 does not permit Jesus to go on the heathen soil of Phoenicia. Jesus turns aside the Canaanite woman's request, "I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (15:24). But this bias is overshadowed by the main theme of the gospel.⁹³ The fact of Gentile Christianity is accepted. The Gentile mission is predicted at 24:14 (cf. 24:9) and 26:13 and is expressly commanded by the Resurrected Christ. This theme also runs through the section 21:28-22:14. 21:28-32 in itself is concerned simply with publicans and harlots. "Truly I say to you, the tax collectors and the harlots go into the Kingdom of God before you" (verse 31b). But conjoined with the two subsequent parables it indicates a missionary sympathy. In 21:33-46, the addition of verses 41b, 43

"And let out the vineyard to other tenants, who will give him the fruits in their seasons ...
Therefore I tell you, the Kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a nation producing the fruits of it"

to the Marcan account of the parable of the wicked husbandmen shows clearly that Matthew understood the parable to predict the Gentile mission (as well as the rejection of the Jews).⁹⁴ The Matthean form of the wedding feast (22:1-14) has the same meaning. "Then he said to his servants, The wedding is ready, but those invited were not worthy. Go therefore to the thoroughfares, and in-

91. See footnote 80, p. 74, above.

92. See McNeile, The Gospel according to St. Matthew, p. 133.

93. Cf. K. Clark in the Journal of Biblical Literature, vol. 66, (1947), pp. 165-172, who writes about "The Gentile Bias in Matthew."

94. Cf. Gould, St. Mark, p. 124.

vite to the marriage feast as many as you find" (verses 8, 9). Our evangelist knew that Judaism had refused the invitation to enter the Kingdom with contumely and that "after its due punishment, others were brought in off the roads in its stead."⁹⁵

For Matthew, Jesus' true attitude toward Gentiles is expressed in the incident concerning the Roman centurion (8:5-13). The evangelist emphasizes this event as the notable exception to our Lord's restriction of His ministry to the Jews.⁹⁶ The special construction which he places upon the incident is to introduce from another Q context verses 11f., which are not in the Lucan parallel (7:1-10):

"I tell you, many will come from the east and west and sit down at table with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the Kingdom of Heaven while the sons of the Kingdom will be thrown into the outer darkness: there men will weep and gnash their teeth" (cf. Lk. 13:28-30; note the allusion to Ps. 106:3 (E. T. 107:3); cf. also Mal. 1:11).

By so placing this saying, Matthew refers it to the admission of the Gentiles into the Kingdom of God.⁹⁷ Faith -- see verse 10; cf. 15:28 -- is sufficient for abandoning Mosaic limitations in the case of Gentiles.

95. Kilpatrick, op. cit., p. 118.

96. Cf. McNeile, op. cit., p. 105.

97. Ibid.

CHAPTER IV: JUDAISM AND THE GENTILES IN THE MINISTRY OF JESUS: I. THE MARCAN SOURCE

Hoskyns and Davey¹ have forcefully shown that the historic Jesus dominated the early Church. With this assurance, the student the life and teaching of Jesus can approach the synoptic record with confidence that he can by exercising caution discover a generally reliable reflection of the mind of Jesus.

Any attempt to portray the teaching of our Lord must begin with the Marcan source. The picture which it presents of Jesus is fuller, yet more obscure and difficult to apprehend, than that of any other source. Critical scholarship in the English-speaking world is generally agreed that the synoptic Marcan source is practically synonymous with our Gospel according to St. Mark and that Mark records information from an eyewitness of the ministry of Jesus.²

A. JESUS' ATTITUDE TOWARD JUDAISM

Our necessary starting-point in this source is the relation of Jesus to the Judaism of His day. On the one hand, there are indications that He lived in His complex racial environment the life of a loyal and devoted Jew, that He was neither an apostate nor an iconoclast. On the other hand, there is Jesus' reputation as the friend of sinners and publicans and the antagonism of the Jewish religious hierarchy which presaged the Crucifixion. It is obvious that a careful investigation of Jesus' attitude toward the institutions and customs of Judaism must be made.

-
1. The Riddle of the New Testament.
 2. See op. cit., p. 240.

The foremost and basic institution of Judaism was (and is) the Torah. A nomistic faith, Judaism considered the Torah a record of the unitary law of God. Neglect or transgression of even the seemingly most trivial prescription of the Torah is in effect disobedience to the revealed will of God and thus may be followed by incommensurable consequences.³ A nation as well as a faith, normative Judaism tended to accord almost the same sacredness to its traditions and customs as it did to the Torah. Its ceremonial and ritual code, being the application of the interpretations of the requirements of God, was considered to be almost equally inviolable.

Thus in investigating Jesus' attitude toward Judaism we shall group the material under two subheadings: 1) our Lord's use of the Torah and 2) His treatment of the ceremonial and ritual law of Judaism.

First, there is Jesus' attitude toward the Torah. It must be noted at the outset that Jesus' "knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures was both extensive and profound."⁴ He drew upon it for inspiration and found within it the ideals and principles which guided and shaped His ministry. The synoptic sources contain some 87 references by Jesus to Old Testament passages.⁵ Mark contains some 37 references.⁶ Our task is to determine the character of Jesus' appeal to Scripture. The first indication is found in His recorded use of the scribal formula gegraptai. Mark reports six passages

3. Cf. Moore, Judaism, vol. 1, p. 235.

4. T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, p. 48.

5. Form criticism has affirmed that Scriptural quotations represent not the mind of Jesus but the interpretation of the Church. But T. W. Manson's observation (quoted above) generally holds. See Hoskyns and Davey, op. cit., pp. 75ff.

6. T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 48, fn. 1.

in which this formula appears. Three of these passages quote the Old Testament:

"And He said to them, Well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites,
ὡς γέγραπται, This people honors me with their lips,
but their heart is far from me;
in vain do they worship me,
teaching as doctrine the precepts of men"
(7:6f., quoting Is. 29:13).

"And He taught them and said to them, οὐ γέγραπται,
My House shall be called a house of prayer for all nations?
But you have made it a den of thieves"
(11:17, quoting Is. 56:7 and Jer. 7:11).

"And Jesus said to them, You will all fall away; ὅτι γέγραπται :
I will strike the shepherd and the sheep will be scattered"
(14:27, quoting Zech. 13:7).

Three passages cite Scripture:

"And He said to them, Elijah does come first to restore all things;
καὶ πῶς γέγραπται of the Son of Man that he should suffer many
things and be treated with contempt" (9:12, citing Mal. 3:23).

"But I tell you that Elijah has come, and they did to him whatever
they pleased, καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπ' αὐτόν" (9:13, citing ?).

"For the Son of Man goes, καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτόν; but woe
to that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed" (14:21, citing
Ps. 41:9).

An analysis of these passages indicates that Jesus did not appeal to the Torah as a final arbitrary authority to whose prescriptions He must subscribe or conform. But rather these passages indicate that Jesus used Scripture in stating a principle of divine rule and as prophetic of the circumstances of His own ministry and that of John the Baptist.⁷

The most certain indication of the nature of Jesus' regard for the Torah can be found by studying in some detail passages which narrate His using it. Mark records three such passages:

7. Cf. the implications of the use of gegraptai in Q and L.

(1) At 10:1-12⁸ the controversy over divorce is reported. When Jesus en route to Jerusalem resumed His ministry in Judea, His ecclesiastical opponents sought to trap Him asking, "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife?" In reply our Master inquired, "What did Moses command you?" The Pharisees answered in accordance with Deut. 24:1f.:

"When a man hath taken a wife, and married her, and it comes to pass that she find no favor in his eyes, because he hath found some unseemly thing in her, then let him write her a bill of divorcement, and give it into her hand and send her out of his house. And when she is departed out of his house, she may go and be another man's wife."

Jesus rebutted,

"For your hardness of heart he wrote this commandment. But from the beginning of creation, God made them male and female. For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife..... What therefore God has joined together, let no man put asunder."

Our Lord's approach to this question was in sharp contrast to that of the Rabbis. The schools of both Hillel and Shammai were singularly concerned with creating the impression that they adhered rigidly to the letter of the Torah. On the other hand, after pointedly asking for the "Law" on the subject, Jesus swept aside its meaning as a human concession to sin, as entirely out of harmony with God's high purpose for married life.⁹ Christ's method was analogous to that of Malachi, who gave out bluntly the statement that God hates divorce (2:13-16).¹⁰ The impression is strong that

8. Cf. Mt. 19:1-9, the secondary account of this event, which has so modified the words of Jesus with interpolated glosses -- "for every cause" at verse 3 and "except for fornication" at verse 9 -- that He is represented as having merely taken sides in a current Rabbinical dispute with Shammai against Hillel.

9. Cf. Zadok. Frag. 7:1-7.

10. Cf. T. W. Manson, op. cit., pp. 292f.

Jesus' appeal to Scripture here was not for any authority it possessed for him "but purely for the reason that there was an inner accord between its spirit and his own."¹¹

(2) At 10:17-22 Jesus directed to the Torah a man who desired knowledge of how to inherit eternal life. The man greeted Jesus with Oriental effusiveness, "Good teacher." Our Lord refused for Himself the appellative ἀγαθε' and insisted that the man contemplate the absolute ἀγαθωσύνη (which is an attribute of God) and measure himself by that supreme standard. Thus in directing the man to the Decalogue for the basis of eternal life, Jesus was referring to the deeper requirements of the Law. This is abundantly clear in His rebuttal to the young man's reply, "Teacher, all these things I have observed from my youth." Our Lord persisted, "One thing you lack." Obedience to the Torah can never be a fait accompli. Its requirement is not simply a prescribed pattern of conduct, but the cultivation of the attitude which enthrones God as the sole Lord of life.¹²

(3) At 12:28-31¹³ Jesus enunciated the Great Commandment. Mark relates that a scribe attracted by the aptness of Jesus' replies in debate and apparently desirous of having the opinion of so wise a teacher on an interesting question asked Him, "Which commandment is the first of all?" That is, "Do you make a distinction between 'weightier' matters and less weighty matters?"¹⁴

11. J. W. Bowman, The Religion of Maturity, pp. 176f.

12. Cf. Major, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 131.

13. The fact that the Marcan episode is considered to be a variant of Lk. 10:25 by some scholars is not crucial here. Conclusions derived from the Marcan account are validated by the whole course of Jesus' ministry.

14. The Matthean account is not to be trusted here. The absolute priority accorded to the principle love (Mk. 12:31b) is weakened to one of logical priority by Matthew.

Jesus replied:¹⁵

"The first is, Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God, the Lord is one: and you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength. The second is this, You shall love your neighbor as yourself. There is no other commandment greater than these."

That is to say, these two commandments take precedence over all others. Or again, there are weightier matters of the Law and less weighty matters. No other commandment can come before them to claim man's obedience. Moral principle rather than positive precept is man's greatest obligation. The principle of love to God and man has absolute priority. Compare Mk. 3:4.

Conclusions concerning Jesus' use of the Torah can now be made with greater assurance. It was for Him no final authority. He sat in judgment upon it, thrusting aside that which compromised the will of God. In doing so, Jesus doubtlessly seemed to be antinomian to the Rabbis.

"He who says, The Torah is not from God, or even if he says, The whole Torah is from God with the exception of this or that verse, which, not God, but Moses spoke from his own mouth -- that soul shall be rooted up" (Babylonian Talmud Sanhedrin 99a).¹⁶

Jesus' approach to the Torah was creative. Whereas the Rabbis found within it prescribed patterns of conduct, our Lord discovered life-invigorating principles. He acted as though He were Lord of the Torah. He set His own interpretations upon the commandments of the Torah and offered them as authoritative declarations of the will of God.¹⁷

15. The combination of these commands to love God and neighbor had already been made in the Testament of the XII Patriarchs, Issachar 5:2; 7:5; Dan. 5:3.

16. Cf. Sifra Ahare Perek, 13 and Yoma 67b, quoted by Moore, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 68.

17. Cf. T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 291; cf. C. H. Dodd, History and the Gospel, pp. 124f.

Second, there is our Lord's relation to the ceremonial and ritual law of Judaism. There are indications (a) that Jesus normally adhered to Jewish customs but (b) that He came into conflict with certain Jewish traditions.

(a) Several passages portray Jesus in normal adherence to Jewish customs. (1) 6:56 (Mt. 14:36) relates to the dress habitually worn by Jesus.¹⁸ This passage reports crowds which sought to touch τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου. The usage of the term "kraspedou" in the LXX¹⁹ indicates that the word is to be translated "fringe" or "tassel" (חֲזָזִים). The priestly law²⁰ commanded the loyal Jew to adorn his garments with this zizith or tassel. "The zizith in fact served as a Jew's uniform whereby he was recognized and distinguished from a Gentile. Hence a Jew must not sell a fringed garment to a non-Jew unless the fringes are removed."²¹ Obviously Jesus' habit of dress was dictated by custom and not by theology. Nonetheless, His dress was that of a good Jew only.

(2) Several passages imply Jesus' deep appreciation and respect for the synagogues. "And εὐθὺς He went into the synagogue" (1:21b). "And He went πάλιν into the synagogue" (3:1a). Note further 1:39 and 6:2. The reasonable inference from these references is that Jesus habitually attended the synagogue although these passages without exception cite occasions on which

18. Cf. Mt. 9:20 and 23:5. That the Marcan parallels do not have the phrase "tou kraspedou" is interesting but not significant here.

19. See Deut. 22:12 and Nu. 15:38.

20. Ibid.

21. Jewish Encyclopedia, vol. 5, p. 522.

Jesus entered the synagogue to teach or entered the synagogue and taught.

(3) The episode 1:40-45 reveals Jesus urgently charging (ἐμβρυησάμενος) a healed leper to go to Jerusalem and act in conformity with ritual law (prescribed at Lev. 14:1ff.). A leper came begging Jesus to heal him. Having done so, Jesus immediately charged him "Go, show yourself to the priest, and offer for your cleansing what Moses commanded, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς." As a witness to what? Allen presses too far his argument that these words mean as proof "that He (Jesus) did not seek to undermine the Mosaic ritual."²² It was not like our Lord to send embassies to Jerusalem to establish His correctness in the Law. Indeed He had just commanded the man to maintain silence about the event. Moreover, our Lord had involved Himself in ceremonial defilement by touching the leper (Lev. 13:46). And there is no indication that He intended to make a sacrifice of purification for Himself. Our Lord had little interest in such types of uncleanness where He Himself was concerned. Note His association with publicans and sinners, below, pp. 87f., passim. The natural meaning of the phrase in its context is certainly "for an official witness to all that you are cleansed." The priest being officer of public health, his acceptance of the leper's sacrifice constituted the public testimony that the leper was cleansed. Jesus' concern here was solely with the reinstatement of the man into normal life with his family and friends.²³

22. St. Matthew, p. 75.

23. Cf. Branscomb, Jesus and the Law of Moses, pp. 116-118.

(4) There are indications that Jesus had deep appreciation and respect for the Temple. Like any devout Jewish pilgrim, our Lord upon entering Jerusalem went immediately to the Temple (11:11). It was for Him as for the whole Jewish nation the special dwelling place of God (11:17). Yet, Jesus held for the Temple the high ideal of Deutero-Isaiah, "a house of prayer for all the nations." Furthermore, He spoke in prophetic manner of its destruction, not as divine judgment against the Temple itself but as punishment to come upon the nation (13:2).²⁴

(5) One passage implies that Jesus took part in the religious festivals. Mark reports only Jesus' participation in the final Passover. But the matter of fact way in which the disciples inquired concerning their preparations for it, "Where will you have us go and prepare for you to eat the Passover?" indicates that this act was no departure from our Lord's custom.²⁵

(b) Mark relates several events which depict Jesus in conflict with orthodox practices. (1) 2:13-17 records an instance in which Jesus ate with publicans and sinners. This event came immediately after the call of Levi (Matthew). The meal apparently took place in the home of Levi.²⁶ Our Lord's companions were πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοί, who were generally regarded as being outside the pale of religious respectability. The publican, being considered notoriously apostate from the Law, was

24.

24. See pp. 115f., below.

25. An implication corroborated by Johannine evidence.

26. So Lk. 5:27-32. But Allen argues that Matthew considered Jesus to have been the host.

88

persona non grata in the Jewish society.²⁷ *Σμαρτωλοί*²⁸ in this context likely refer to those who did not keep the Law. They tended to disregard ritual and even at times the weightier matters of the Law. Religious leaders contemptuously called them *קטני-חכמה*. Respectable Jews avoided them as unclean.²⁹ By eating in their homes one ran the risk of personal defilement through eating unclean food³⁰ or through contact with garments, dishes or articles ceremonially unclean. Further, one should "not eat with people of the land" "because one might be drawn to accept their manner of life."³¹ Thus Jesus' association with the am- ha- aretz was reprehensible to the Pharisees. "With publicans and sinners he eats and drinks!" To this criticism Jesus replied, "Those who are well³² have no need of a physician, but they that are sick;³³ I came not to call the righteous, but sinners."³⁴ Our Lord must have spoken with irony. It is unquestionable that He objected to the division of men as "righteous" and "sinners" on the basis of

27. Along with him his family was despised by the pious. His apostacy made his money unacceptable for the public alms chest and his integrity inadequate for witnessing (Tos. Demai iii, 4, quoted by Strack-Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testaments aus Talmud und Midrash, vol. 1, p. 379).

28. The word is translated "prostitutes" in some contexts.

29. Compare the Brahmin's refusal to associate with Untouchables.

30. E.g. food which had not been tithed, or was improperly killed, prepared, or served.

31. Gemara, Berakot 43b (quoted by Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 498).

32. Mark "*καθαίροντες* "; Luke "*δικαίουντες*."

33. Prof. Dodd has forcefully urged that the moral in this parable, "I came not... sinners" is an editorial interpretation of the parable on allegorical lines (The Parables of the Kingdom, pp. 117f.)². Yet, the thought in it unquestionably represents an element in the earliest tradition (Dodd, History and the Gospel, p. 124).

34. Matthew by adding at this point "Go and learn what this means, I desire mercy and not sacrifice" emphasized the difference in the points of view held by Jesus and the Pharisees to religion.

man-made patterns of conduct³⁵ and that He questioned man's righteousness before God.³⁶ He always took the sinner's part whenever He found the Pharisees leveling criticism at them.

(2) 2:18-20 reports Jesus' refusal to authorize fasting. There is no sufficient ground for denying the authenticity of this event.³⁷ Nor is it necessary to find its sitz im leben in the period of mourning experienced by the disciples of John the Baptist following upon his death.³⁸ This episode would hardly refer to the required fast at the day of Atonement. It could have been a fast at the time of an autumn drought. To the question why His disciples did not fast Jesus replied with a brief parabolic saying, "Can the wedding guests fast while the bridegroom is with them?" That is to say, can those who experience the joy of the heavenly feast be expected to mourn? Fasting may be considered of religious value not for its own sake but only if it serves the immediate needs of human personalities.³⁹ Jesus conceived His disciples to be in a situation to which joy and not grief was appropriate. They had entered the joys of the Kingdom.⁴⁰

35. See Mt. 7:1f.

36. 10:18; cf. Mt. 7:3. See Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, p. 51.

37. Contra Wellhausen, Das Marci Evangelium, p. 20. Dibelius termed this incident a "paradigm" belonging to the most authentic part of the narrative tradition (From Tradition to Gospel, p. 43). Albertz from a different point of view regards it as having "uncommon historical value" (Die Synoptischen Streitgespräche, 57-64).

38. This view (adopted by Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 31) is possible, but improbable. It is sounder to interpret this event in light of the known non-ascetic character of the whole ministry of Jesus than in the light of a momentary contrast between the practice of Jesus and His disciples and that of John's disciples at a hypothetical incident. Further, there is no reason why Jesus and His disciples should have fasted at the death of John.

39. Cf. Bowman, op. cit., p. 185.

40. So Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, pp. 115f. Cf. J. Weiss, op. cit., p. 160.

(3) Two passages narrate Jesus' conflict with the Pharisaic observance of the Sabbath.⁴¹ 2:23-28 depicts the disciples plucking "ears of grain" on the Sabbath. In reply to the Pharisaic charge that His associates were doing "what is not lawful on the Sabbath," Jesus cited the case of David's eating the shewbread.⁴² The Rabbis had justified this act by arguing that David's hunger had reached the point of necessity.⁴³ And they had a principle that the saving of life on the Sabbath was permissible. "Behold, Ex. 31:14 commands, Observe the Sabbath, for it is holy for you, that means, the Sabbath is given for you, and not you for the Sabbath."⁴⁴ Yet, this attitude was coupled with strict insistence on obedience to the exact requirements of the Law,⁴⁵ which forbade threshing. On the other hand, Jesus acted consistently on the principle, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath."⁴⁶ Jesus insisted that ministry to real human need is not to be thwarted by restrictive laws.⁴⁷

41. For an excellent discussion of Jesus and the Sabbath, see T. W. Manson, Judaism and Christianity, vol. 3, pp. 130ff.

42. I Sam. 21:1-6.

43. Not mentioned in I Sam. but stressed in Menahot 95b and the Midrash Yalkut Shion'one (quoted in the Yelammendenu) on I Sam. 21:5 (quoted by Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 624).

44. Attributed to both R. Simeon ben Menasya and R. Jonathan ben Joseph (quoted by Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 5).

45. Cf. Branscomb, op. cit., p. 142.

46. This aphorism may have been current in Jesus' day (see above, fn. 44) and merely quoted by Him. Yet, it was the only Sabbath law for our Lord.

47. The significance of our Lord's conflict with the orthodox observance of the Sabbath cannot be grasped apart from recognition of the fundamental place that this observance had in Judaism. The Sabbath as an institution was regarded as an eternal covenant with God; profanation of it was a national sin from the days in the wilderness (Ex. 20:12f.). Correct observance of it would bring deliverance. "if Israel should keep two Sabbaths strictly according to rule, they would be delivered forthwith" (Bab. Shabbath 118b, quoted by Moore, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 26; cf. Is. 58:13f., 56:2ff.). Against this understanding Jesus urged: set behavior patterns do not bring the malkuth; it is already uniquely present demanding mercy and justice.

3:1-6 records Jesus' defense of healing on the Sabbath. In a synagogue on a Sabbath Jesus saw a man with a withered hand. As the Pharisees watched accusingly, Jesus addressed the man, "Come here," and asked the Pharisees, "Is it lawful on the Sabbath to do good or to do harm? to save life or to kill?" They remained silent, and our Lord healed the man. The scribal answer would have been "It is lawful to save life."⁴⁸ But the scribe would have urged that the man with the withered hand could wait until the morrow without danger to his life. But Jesus healed the man on the Sabbath. He believed that the redeeming work of the Kingdom of God takes precedence over the Sabbath laws.⁴⁹ It is always right to good on the Sabbath.⁵⁰

(4) 7:1-23 reports that Jesus rejected the concept of ritual purity. The original nucleus of this event seems to have been verses 1, 2, 5, 8, 14, and 15.⁵¹ The incident was in the first instance an encounter with the Pharisaic tendency to elaborate and extend the ideal of a ceremonially clean nation. Pharisees and scribes observed that the disciples ate without going through ritual ablutions (in which, according to Lk. 11:38, they were following the example of their Master). Thereupon the Pharisees and scribes asked Jesus, "Why do your disciples not live according to the tradition of the elders, but eat with hands defiled?" Religious ablutions were not yet obligatory for the laity. They belonged to Pharisaic practice. In this incident we see evidence

48. See fn. 44, above, p. 90, and Moore, op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 19, 30f.

49. Cf. T. W. Manson, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 482.

50. See fn. 47, above, p. 90.

51. Cf. Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 93, who omits verse 8.

of the Pharisaic zeal which bore fruit in the second century when⁵²
 ablutions before eating any food were obligatory for all Jews.
 To this query Jesus replied, You neglect the will of God and e-⁵³
 stablish the traditions of men (paraphrasing verse 8). Thereto
 Mark attached the apposite words from Isaiah (29:13),

"This people honors me with their lips,
 but their heart is far from me;
 in vain do they worship me,
 teaching as doctrine the precepts of men."

That is to say, your emphasis on ritual is causing you to neglect
 the Torah. But this is not all that Jesus had to say. A materi-
 alistic interpretation of purity is in error. Addressing the
 crowd Jesus proclaimed,

"Hear me, all of you, and understand: there is nothing outside
 a man which by going into him can defile him; but the things
 which come out of a man are what defile him."⁵⁴

This saying is not to be regarded as an ex cathedra pronouncement
 urging the abolition of large parts of the Pentateuch. The saying
 doubtlessly had a more ad hoc application.⁵⁵ Its original meaning
 can best be determined in the light of Jesus' attitude toward the
 Sabbath. See above, pp. 90f. The work of the Kingdom of God takes
 precedence over the Levitical laws of purity. It follows then

52. This tradition was probably a Mishnah on Is. 1:16, "Wash you,
 make clean," where the exhortation of the prophet is, however, to
 moral reformation and not bathing the body.

53. There is no good reason to question the authenticity of this
 saying. It is apt to the context and reflects the mind of Jesus.
 See Branscomb, op. cit., p. 123.

54. The authenticity of verse 15 has been forcefully questioned.
 It is urged that Jesus could not have spoken so categorically about
 unclean things or else the controversy which nearly split the early
 Church would have been impossible. Moreover, it is maintained that
 the saying abrogates too much of the Pentateuch and everyday Jewish
 practice to have been uttered by Jesus. Yet, there is evidence for
 assuming the basic authenticity of this verse. There can be no
 doubt that He showed a pronounced indifference to questions of
 ceremonial cleanness. Note His association with am- ha- aretz, and
 see further, Branscomb, op. cit., pp. 125f.

55. Rawlinson, op. cit., ad. loc.

that accidental physical contact with the heathen on the street, social intercourse with the am- ha- aretz, even eating ceremonially unclean food in the homes of the am- ha- aretz does not necessarily make one unclean. A good man bringing forth good things out of the treasury of a loving heart does not become evil in God's sight by anything which goes into him.⁵⁶

Certain conclusions may be safely drawn. Our Lord did not regard institutions and customs as sacred in themselves. They were secondary to spiritual ends; they served real human need, or else they had no real value. Jesus was interested in man as man; He rejected those traditions which tended to exclude men from religious fellowship.

B. THE EXPRESSED MISSION OF JESUS

The force of the personality of Jesus impresses itself upon the mind of the student of His life and ministry. That our Lord had a unique consciousness is inescapable. Unless this fact is recognized, the mission of Jesus can not be apprehended.

The unique consciousness of Jesus touches ground, so to speak, in history at the Baptismal Experience (1:9-11 and parallels).⁵⁷ The Bath Qol proclaims, "You are my beloved Son" (1:11). This experience sends our Lord forth from the quiet, though pious, life of an am- ha- aretz into a public ministry which challenged Judaism and made His life forfeit. Prof. T. W. Manson has pointed out the essential difference between the inaugural experiences of the

56. The sole restraint which prevented Judaism from making this step was the absolute authority of the Torah. See Moore, op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 6f.

57. Hebrews 1:5 seems to refer to this experience.

prophets and that of Jesus. The prophets received a message and a mission; Jesus, a status and a relation to God.⁵⁸ The key to the unique consciousness of our Lord is His awareness of unique spiritual affinity to God. The evidence for Jesus' consciousness of Sonship is not staggering. But criticism which would deny it has to find some other basis for the primitive Christian reference to God as "the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," and it has to explain away some not insignificant synoptic evidence. Other than the Baptismal Experience there are three strands of evidence in Mark which are most logically explained by unique Sonship to God on Jesus' part. They are (1) the obvious reference to the "one other, οὐδὲν ἀντιπαραστήσαντος" in the parable of the wicked husbandmen,⁵⁹ (2) Jesus' assent to the question of the high priest, "Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?" and His consequent conviction for blasphemy,⁶⁰ and (3) the significant fact that Jesus referred to God as Father only four times (and then only to the disciples after the Petrine confession, 8:38, 11:25, 13:32, 14:36) and implied the Fatherhood of God once (12:1-11). The paucity of references by Jesus to God as Father in the synoptic sources -- there are not

58. The Teaching of Jesus, p. 103.

59. Discussed, below, p. 108.

60. One can have no certain knowledge that this account of the trial and conviction before the Sanhedrin is historically accurate in detail. The probability of Christian tradition having an eyewitness report of the event rests upon the assumption that either Nicodemus or Joseph of Arimathea was present. Wellhausen's proposal that these verses are an interpolation (op. cit., p. 132) does utter violence to the text. It remains possible but not necessary that these verses have been recast to conform with Christian ideas. See Otto, op. cit., p. 227. But as G. A. F. Knight has pointed out, "To have laid claim to the rank of Messiah would not have laid Jesus open to the charge of blasphemy" (From Moses to Paul, p. 157).

more than 42 -- obviously implies, as T. W. Manson has noted, that the Fatherhood of God was no theological commonplace but a genuine experience for Jesus.⁶¹ Compare Lk. 10:21-22/Mt. 11:25-27 (Q); see below, pp. 127f.

The Baptismal Experience crystallized Jesus' experience of sharing in the life of God. Sonship to the Father became the focus and periphery of life. He set out to bring others to share in His fulness of life. See Lk. 10:22/Mt. 11:27 (Q). By projecting His personality to those who were desirous of receiving His fulness of life He sought to create a people of God, a community sharing the spirit of God.⁶² Our present source indicates that Jesus engaged in five phases of activity so that men might enter the malkuth of God.

(1) He proclaimed the presence of the malkuth. Prof. W. Manson has noted that the "actual starting-point, outlook, and motive of the public ministry of Jesus" is recorded in the summary at Mk. 1:15:⁶³ "The time is fulfilled, and the malkuth of God ἤγγικεν." Prof. Dodd's equation of ἤγγικεν here with ἐφθασεν at Lk. 11:20/Mt. 12:28 (Q) and his resultant translation of both as "has arrived"⁶⁴ has been ably challenged on the linguistic side;⁶⁵ yet, this verse can be reasonably understood to mean that the malkuth or sovereign rule of God is impinging upon contemporary history. This impassioned pronouncement of the presence and power of God

61. Op. cit., p. 101f.

62. See Knight, op. cit., p. 183.

63. Jesus the Messiah, p. 96; cf. Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 13.

64. The Parables of the Kingdom, p. 44.

65. J. Y. Campbell in the Expository Times, vol. 48, pp. 91ff.

is coupled with the admonition, "μετανοείτε" i.e. "turn yourselves around and accept the will of God for your lives." Jesus' proclamation of the Kingdom was characterized by the invitation to enter the malkuth, i.e. to become a child of God. This invitation becomes more explicit in Jesus' conversations with His disciples following the Petrine confession.⁶⁶

(2) Our Lord performed "mighty works." The miracles were for Jesus witness to the presence of the malkuth and its righteousness. Such is the meaning at 3:27,⁶⁷

"But no one can enter a strong man's house and plunder his goods, unless he first binds the strong man; then indeed he may plunder his house."

Jesus' exorcisms are not evidence of a dissension in the kingdom of Satan but witness to a mightier malkuth. The mighty works were not signs to awaken faith. "And He could do no mighty work there (Nazareth),... And He marvelled because of their unbelief" (6:5f.; cf. 8:12b). Rather they were signs to the faithful. "And He said to her, Daughter, your faith has made you well" (5:34a).⁶⁸ In performing a mighty work Jesus was bringing God to man, helping men to apprehend the nearness and power of God. Such is forcefully elucidated at 2:5b, where our Lord was not content merely to say, "Rise, take up your pallet and walk," but said, "My son, your sins are forgiven you."⁶⁹ Jesus acted in God's name.⁷⁰ He sought to

66. See T. W. Manson, op. cit., pp. 118ff.

67. Cf. R. Bultmann, Jesus and the Word, p. 193.

68. Cf. Lk. 7:9b/Mt. 8:10.

69. Bultmann has termed this saying an accretion (Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition, p. 6). But its authenticity appears necessary to account for the insertion of this issue over forgiveness in this context. See W. Manson, op. cit., p. 42.

70. See Knight, op. cit., pp. 157f.

bring men into the experience of divine love.⁷¹

(3) Jesus sought out "publicans and sinners."⁷² The saying, "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners" (2:17),⁷³ indicates the consuming interest of our Lord in the religious outcasts. The significance of this interest can be most clearly observed in relation to the Pharisaic attitude toward the am-ha-aretz. Abrahams has noted that "there was in the Pharisaism of all ages a real anxiety to make the return of the sinner easy," though "it was inclined to leave the initiative to the sinner, although it always maintained God's readiness to take the first step."⁷⁴ Jesus took the initiative Himself. He carried the redeeming power of the malkuth into the midst of sinners that they might share the fulness of His life.⁷⁵

(4) Our Lord called disciples "He appointed twelve to be with Him, and to be sent out to preach" (3:14). Jesus' admonition, "Follow me," was first of all an invitation to share the fulness of His life.⁷⁶ It was to the disciples that He revealed His experience of the Fatherliness of God (8:38, 11:24, 13:32). He sought to bring them to know the Father as He Himself knew God. This apprenticeship in His spirit made them His true kin (3:34f.), would lead them into suffering (8:38ff.), "gave them authority over unclean spirits" (6:7). They were the first in a new community of His spirit (14:22-25). It is noteworthy that Q indicates

71. See G. S. Duncan, Jesus, Son of Man, pp. 160-162. Cf. Dodd, History and the Gospel, p. 124; Hoskyns and Davey, op. cit., p. 156.

72. See B. W. Bacon, Jesus Son of God, p. 48.

73. See above, p. 89, fn. 33.

74. Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, 1st series, p. 58.

75. Cf. Dodd, op. cit., p. 124, who rightly insists that Jesus' championship of the disreputable is an expression of the "sovereign mercy of God in calling whom He will into His Kingdom."

76. Cf. Duncan, op. cit., p. 212.

that this community was apparently open to others (Lk. 9:57-60/Mt. 8:19-22). The ultimate purpose of Jesus' call of disciples was that they should become a "saving remnant."⁷⁷ "They went out and preached that men should repent" (6:12).

(5) Jesus sacrificed His life. There are in our present source several sayings which depict our Lord as being convinced that rejection, suffering, and death were imminent for Him. It is significant that these sayings follow the Petrine confession. Men -- few men it is true, but, nevertheless, men -- had identified the hope of Israel, the malkuth of Yahweh, with Him. These men must know the character of His messiahship.⁷⁸ Thus He taught them.⁷⁹

"That the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again" (8:31; cf. 9:12, 9:31, and 10:33-34).

"Are you able to drink the cup that I drink, or to be baptized with the baptism with which I am baptized?" (10:38).

There is no compelling reason to doubt that these sayings are based on authentic oracles of Jesus⁸⁰ or that He applied to Himself the

77. This fact received an extreme but significant statement from T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus.

78. As Denny noted, "When Jesus unfolds Messiahship, it contains death" (The Death of Christ, p. 321).

79. It is noteworthy that the predictions of Passion were addressed only to the disciples.

80. They are rejected on formal grounds by Bultmann, who maintains that in the prophetic consciousness of Jesus and in the faith of the primitive Church the Son of Man is always "the Coming One." Dibelius also attributes them to the evangelist (op. cit., pp. 226 and 230). But this judgment is hardly admissible. Prediction of His death would seem to be psychologically a necessary precondition for the emergence of the joyous Resurrection Faith. The course of His ministry would certainly indicate to Him what was in store, and He apparently considered it the fate common to all prophets (see Lk. 13:32). Moreover, to term them church products is to credit the creative originality, which reinterpreted the idea of the Son of Man in terms of the Suffering Servant, to a disciple whose faith would seem to require the Master to have had just that originality. W. Manson has observed that 8:31 and 10:33f. show ex post facto (cont.)

title "Son of Man."⁸¹ Prescience of martyrdom had become characteristic of the prophetic consciousness of Israel at its highest tension.⁸² Jesus Himself indicated that it was nothing more than a prophet could expect (Lk. 13:33 - L). It is not difficult to believe with Goguel that it was this clear prospect of suffering and rejection which led Jesus to the final identification of the Messiah's career with His own.⁸³ He referred to His death as an event through which He would be "perfected," *τελειοῦμαι*.⁸⁴

Early tradition depicts Jesus perceiving His imminent death not merely as a historical certainty but primarily as a dogmatic necessity appertaining to His role as the Son of Man.⁸⁵ This belief is set forth in the Marcan passages noted above, but it finds its most definitive expression in two other Marcan sayings:

1. "For the Son of Man also came not to be served, but to serve and δοῦναι his life as a λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν" (10:45).

H. Rashdall considered this oracle a "doctrinally colored insertion" probably "never uttered by our Lord."⁸⁶ But neither the style⁸⁷ nor content⁸⁸ preclude the possibility that it is an authentic say-

details, and that (;12 has the rugged and irreducible form of an original oracle (op. cit., p. 129). Cf. Otto, op. cit., pp. 360ff.

81. See e.g., Otto, op. cit., pp. 226ff.; W. Manson, op. cit., 66.

82. See O. Michel, Prophet und Martyrer (1932) cited by W. Manson, op. cit., p. 126.

83. Life of Jesus, pp. 390ff.

84. Lk. 13:32 (L).

85. See Otto, op. cit., pp. 246ff.; Denney, op. cit.

86. The Idea of the Atonement in Christian Theology, pp. 30ff.

87. See fn. 80, above. It is sufficient here to note the judgment of Principal Taylor that Jesus "reinterpreted the idea of the Son of Man in terms of the Suffering Servant" (Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 282). Cf. Otto., op. cit., pp. 249ff.

88. Bousset affirms that it is a dogmatic development of the original oracle at Lk. 22:27 (Kyrios Christos, p. 8); but see Otto, op. cit., pp. 271ff. Wellhausen (op. cit., p. 91) and Loisy (Évangiles Synoptiques, vol. 2, p. 241) consider it to belong to a different sequence of ideas from verse 44. It is also alleged to be a Paulinism. Against these objections it can be pointed out that (1) the context of Lk. 22:27 (the Last Supper) probably suggested to the

ing of Jesus. The probability of its genuineness is enhanced by the presence of several thoughts within Judaism: (a) the forfeit state of the soul of the sinner, he cannot ransom it himself, and no one else can (Ps. 49:7-9; cf. I Enoch 98:10); (b) a trespass-offering for the iniquity of Israel to be made by the Suffering Servant (Is. 53); and (b) the redemptive significance of martyr sufferings of the righteous (4 Macc. 6:28f., 17:21f.).⁸⁹ Finally the restraint of this saying⁹⁰ and the necessity of having it for understanding the mystery of the Cross suggest that it is an authentic utterance of our Lord.⁹¹

This oracle which is reminiscent of Is. 53⁹² defines the significance of Jesus' death. Our Lord's death was to complete and consummate His mission: ἡλθεν ... δοῦναι (aorist indicating a single, definitive act). It would be an expiatory self-sacrifice (λύτρον),⁹³ redeeming many from the kingdom of Satan,⁹⁴ and conversely bringing them into the fellowship of God's grace.

Evangelist that "service" rendered by Jesus among His followers had a soteriological significance and that (2) if the Lucan saying is out of its original context, it is not impossible that Jesus might have on different occasions spoke of the humility of the Servant and of the redemptive sacrifice of the Servant. (3) Sacrifice is not irrelevant to the context of service but the natural climax. (4) λύτρον is not Pauline; it is characteristic of early Gentile Christianity in general. See W. Manson, op. cit., p. 132.

89. See further, W. Manson, op. cit., pp. 132f.

90. Cf. Taylor, who opines that the saying is not "reasonably explicit" enough to be a community product (op. cit., p. 105).

91. "The Church did not produce, but was produced by that Messianic faith, and without that faith it would not have come into being" (Otto, op. cit., p. 159).

92. The Son of Man, like the Suffering Servant, "serves," "gives his life" as an offering, which is "for many." See Otto, op. cit., pp. 256-261.

93. Lutron is a metaphor coming perhaps from Ps. 49:79, at which Cremer points out the analogous connection λύτρον equals ἐξέλεσθαι (Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek, p. 408).

94. Cf. Taylor, op. cit., pp. 104, 250ff.

- ii. "This is my body....
This is my blood of the *συνθήκη*, which is shed for many" (14:22-24; Mt. adds "for the forgiveness of sins" (26:28). Both I Cor. 11:25 and Lk. 22:20 have "new covenant.")

The scope of this paper permits only a passing allusion to the varied and difficult problems associated with the Last Supper. They are not equally critical to the question which we confront.⁹⁵ Our task here is twofold: Was the connection between the Supper and His death made by Jesus? If so, what significance does the Supper impute to His death?

(a) The authenticity of this narrative. Bultmann has termed the accounts of the Last Supper "kultuslegende" which owe their origin to Hellenistic circles in early Christianity.⁹⁶ However, against this judgment it can be urged that the New Testament dogma of the Last Supper "can not be derived, even collaterally or by the way of supplement, from pagan sources,"⁹⁷ that the underlying ideas are Jewish, that the creative originality which has brought within the orbit of a uniform conception elements from the ideas of the Suffering Servant, the Messianic Hope, and the Kingdom of God is more characteristic of an original thinker than of a community,⁹⁸ and that Christians from the first felt themselves exempted from the doom of the Coming Judgment. It would thus seem not improbable that the accounts of the Last Supper are based upon genuine utterances of Jesus. So Principal Taylor: "It is His own words which bring the death and the supper into other into

95. They are considered at length by Taylor, op. cit., pp. 115-142.

96. Geschichte, p. 185; cf. Dibelius, op. cit., p. 206.

97. C. Clemen, Primitive Christianity and Its Non-Jewish Sources, p. 266; cf. A. E. J. Rawlinson, The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ, p. 279.

98. Cf. Taylor, op. cit., p. 124f.

closest connexion."⁹⁹ Whether the Marcan or the Lucan words are the more original need not be settled here. The two different traditions refer the same significance to Jesus' death.¹⁰⁰

(b) The significance of His death. It is not necessary to enter into the vexed question of the historical occasion.¹⁰¹ In any event Paschal associations were probably present to the mind of Jesus. His thought, nonetheless, shows evidence of being influenced by the idea of the Suffering Servant. He combined the concepts of a Divine Covenant (Is. 42:6; 49:8) and the death of a Mediator (Is. 52:10-12).¹⁰² While eating, Jesus took bread, blessed, broke, and gave it to His disciples saying,¹⁰³ "Den hu guthi."¹⁰⁴ Afterwards when they had drunk from the cup, He said, "Den (haden) hu idmi delikeyama."¹⁰⁵ Both the breaking of the bread and the pouring out of the wine were "effective representations" of His death.¹⁰⁶ His command, "Take," indicates that the bread and wine were more than adventitious symbols. Men are to become sharers in His sacrifice, and thus claimed, committed, and

99. Op. cit., p. 285.

100. Cf. W. Manson, op. cit., pp. 145f. Taylor prefers the Marcan tradition; Otto, the Lucan.

101. The Johannine tradition and the implications of Mk. 14:2, Lk. 22:14f., Mk. 14:45, and Mk. 15:21 are against identification with the Passover. The Last Supper has been identified with both the Qiddush celebration (e.g., W.O.E. Oesterley, The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy) and a Chaburah meal (e.g., Otto, op. cit., pp. 278-284).

102 Cf. G. Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua, p. 170.

103. The variances in the accounts of tradition preclude any certain knowledge about the details of the Last Supper. The Marcan account is supported substantially by the Pauline which claims dominical authority (I Cor. 11:23-25). The accounts have been conformed to liturgical practices. Nonetheless, Taylor concludes that "unhistorical elements have not been imposed upon the primitive tradition to any important degree" (op. cit., p. 117).

104. As reproduced by Dalman.

105. As reproduced by Dalman.

106. For enacted predictions, cf. Ezek. 4, Is. 30:3, Jer. 19:10.

consecrated into a *ἁγιασθήναι* with God.¹⁰⁷ Jesus gave His life that men might share in the grace of God.

The question stated by Harnack,¹⁰⁸ "Did Jesus' view reach out beyond the confines of His little Jewish world and take into its concern the spiritual needs of all men, or was that view restricted to the interests of His own people?" must now be considered. It is common knowledge that Jesus directed His ministry to the Jews. He was *διάκονος τῆς περιτομῆς* (Rom. 15:8). Two pieces of information in Mark indicate the general scope of our Lord's ministry. One is the singular journey out of Israel, the incident involving the Syrophoenician woman. The other is the series of enigmatic yet deeply significant indications of His Messianic claims during Passion Week.

(1) The Syrophoenician woman (7:24-30; cf. Mt. 15:21-28). The Marcan account can be treated as substantially authentic.¹⁰⁹ The peculiarities of the Matthean narrative can be adequately explained as effects of editorial activity.¹¹⁰ Two questions must be answered here. (a) Why did Jesus enter into pagan territory? Mark relates that Jesus *ὑπέβη* into the region of Tyre (and Sidon)¹¹¹ and entered a home seeking anonymity. The desire to keep His presence there secret refutes Otto's contention that He entered Phoenicia to evangelize the "lost sheep of Israel."¹¹² Marcan chronology suggests that the journey was due to the growing

107. Cf. Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-142, 261f.

108. The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, vol. 1, chapter 4.

109. Dibelius classifies it as an impure paradigm.

110. See below, chapter 7, p. ^θ

111. "And Sidon" omitted by D W ^θ it sy^s.

112. *Op. cit.*, pp. 16-17.

hostility of ecclesiastical and political leaders in Galilee.¹¹³
 But this trip probably arose out of the simple desire to find
 privacy and quiet.¹¹⁴

(b) What happened between Jesus and the woman? Mark relates that concealment was denied Jesus. A pagan, Greek-speaking woman¹¹⁵ came to Him requesting that He exorcise a demon from her daughter. Jesus replied with words which prima facie appear to be a gratuitous insult as well as a refusal: "Let the children first be fed, for it is not right to take the children's bread and throw it to the *κωαρίους* ." The difficulty of this saying has led to several interesting attempts to deny its genuineness as an oracle of our Lord.¹¹⁶ But the difficulty of it bespeaks its genuineness. Several factors help in understanding its meaning: (i) Jesus' view of the woman's request; (ii) the metaphorical nature of Jesus' reply; and (iii) the metaphorical character of the woman's successful rejoinder. (i) From Jesus' point of view the woman's request was a pagan's desire simply for a physical cure. This is important for understanding Jesus' reply for two reasons. First, He was apparently free of any racial bias. No word reveals any antipathy for Romans or other Gentiles. Among those He cured were the servant of a Roman centurion and a Samaritan leper. The man cited as embodying true neighborliness was a Samaritan. Second, the

113. So Burkitt, Gospel History and Its Transmission, p. 92.

114. See above, pp. 59f.; cf. Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 98.

115. Such seems to be indicated by "a Greek, a Syrophoenician by race." Cf. Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 100.

116. T. R. Glover has come up with the ingenuous suggestion that the woman herself was the first to mention the "dogs" and that the allusion was thrown back into the words of Jesus (Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire, p. 127, fn. 1). J. Warschauer has urged that the saying was not uttered by Jesus at all but "by one or other of the disciples" (op. cit., p. 190).

miracles were for Jesus witness to the presence and power of God. He was not content merely to relieve physical suffering; He desired no magician's following. He performed mighty works only where people were prepared to receive them as experiences of the love of God. Note that the Roman centurion was apparently a *σεβόμενος* and that the Samaritan belonged to the Mosaic tradition. (ii) Jesus' reply is obviously metaphorical. *τὰ τέκνα* are manifestly the Jews; *ὁ ἄρτος* is apparently experience of God's blessings; *τὰ κυνάρια* are the Gentiles. Certainly the exact meaning of the word *κυνάριον* is important. And it is the more so, since it is possible that our Lord spoke Greek on this occasion.¹¹⁷ *κυνάριον* is a double diminutive. It refers to a house dog, a pet, a friend and companion of man. The term used by Jews to refer contemptuously to Gentiles is *κύων*, a dog of the streets, a scavenger.¹¹⁸ Jesus did contrast Jews and Gentiles. But His contrast is based solely on religious grounds, namely their relation to the Father. The Jews are God's children; pagans are not. Yet, pagans are friends and companions of the *τεκνῶν* and as such have a place in the household. This point of view is not strange on the lips of one who lived in "Galilee of the Gentiles." (iii) The woman's rejoinder takes up the metaphor of Jesus. The dogs *ὑποκείμεναι τῇς τραπέζης* are Gentiles in close association with Jews. *τὰ ψιχία τῶν παιδίων* are insights from the religion of Israel. The woman is emphasizing the fact that

117. Of this we can not be sure. But it is probable both that the woman's language was Greek and that Jesus spoke Greek (the lingua franca) as well as His native tongue. See Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua, pp. 5-7.

118. The term *κύων* is used to reproduce words of Jesus at Lk. 16:21; *cf.* Mt. 7:6, on which see p. 170, below.

there are Gentiles who are *τεβόμενοι*. In the light of these considerations the reply of Jesus would be: The Jews must receive the expressions of God's love; it is not right to waste evidences of the presence and power of God on those who are not prepared to receive them as experiences of Divine grace. But the woman replied to the effect that she was a *τεβόμενος* and not unprepared to receive the exorcism as an experience of God's love.

Dibelius' conclusion that Jesus fulfilled her request "but expressly emphasizes... that his mission is directed only to Israel"¹¹⁹ is quite true. But it must be urged that Jesus did not desist from ministering to *τεβόμενοι* and Samaritans.

(2) The series of enigmatic but highly significant claims to Messiahship made by Jesus in Jerusalem during Passion Week. (a) The triumphal entry (11:1-11 and parallels). There is no good reason for doubting the historicity of this event.¹²⁰ The entry is an acted parable.¹²¹ He who could not die outside of Jerusalem¹²² must die as an avowed Messiah.¹²³ Thus our Lord entered Jerusalem in Messianic fashion. But He made the character of His Messianic claim by fulfilling the prophecy of Zechariah. He claimed a spiritual and non-political Messiahship.¹²⁴

(b) The cleansing of the Temple (11:15-18 and parallels).

119. Jesus, p. 60.

120. Cf. Loisy, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 215; cf. vol. 2, p. 261. Dibelius who called it a cultus-legend determined not by "the holy person of Jesus but (by) the holy word of the O. T.," remarks that "the existence of this legend would be comprehensible most easily if Jesus had given cause for it" (From Tradition to Gospel, 122).

121. Cf. Duncan, op. cit., p. 130.

122. Lk. 13:33.

123. Cf. Robinson, Matthew, p. 171.

124. Cf. Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 151.

The historical character of this event is beyond reasonable doubt.¹²⁵ In this act Jesus implicitly asserted a claim to a Messianic office.¹²⁶ Both His act and words (quoted from Is. 56:7 and Jer. 7:11) marked His claim as spiritual and non-political.

(c) The parable of the wicked husbandmen (12:1-10 and parallels). The parable is, as Loisy insists,¹²⁷ a transparent allegory. The man is God; the vineyard, Israel; the tenants, the religious hierarchy; the servants, the prophets; and the Son, Jesus. But this does not preclude its authenticity.¹²⁸ Jesus in all probability used allegory.¹²⁹ Nor is there any detail in these verses¹³⁰ which would seem improbable in the mouth of our Lord. The absence of any allusion to the Resurrection precludes its being the creation of the Church.¹³¹ In this parable (based on Is. 5:2ff.) Jesus directly challenged the Jewish leaders with the claim of being God's only (ἀγαπητός) Son.¹³²

(d) The exhortation about David's son (12:35-37 and parallels). There is no convincing reason against its authenticity.¹³³

125. See J. Weiss, who places it in the early ministry of Jesus (Schriften, vol. 1, pp. 165f.). Dibelius termed it a paradigm.

126. Cf. Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 156; Gould, op. cit., p. 213.

127. Op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 310f.

128. See Dodd, who stoutly defends the genuineness of Mk. 12:1-3, 5-9a (The Parables of the Kingdom, pp. 124ff.).

129. See W. J. Moulton in the Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, article "Parable," pp. 312-317.

130. Verses 41b and 43 in the Matthean parallel excepted. See p. 78, above.

131. F. C. Burkitt in Transactions of the Third International Congress of Religion, pp. 321-328.

132. Cf. Duncan, op. cit., p. 107.

133. J. Weiss (op. cit., vol. 1, p. 189) and Bousset (op. cit., p. 43) view it as a church protest against the too earthly Jewish Messianic ideal of the Son of David. This doubt overlooks the fact that Jesus was, and knew that He was, of the lineage of David (Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 174).

Jesus re-defined the concept of the Davidic Messiah, emphasizing the non-nationalistic character of His Messianic claim.

(e) The confession before the Sanhedrin (14:61f. and parallels). This passage calls for extreme caution.¹³⁴ It can be said with confidence, however, that Jesus made a Messianic claim which the Sanhedrin pronounced blasphemous.¹³⁵ This claim was to Sonship. To have claimed simply to be the "Messiah" would not have been blasphemy.¹³⁶

In these events it is apparent that Jesus regarded His ministry as the culmination of God's dealings with Israel. He had come to fulfill "the Law and the Prophets."¹³⁷ Thus it was in Jerusalem in the presence of the people during the Passover season that He publicly made His claim. As Dibelius observed, Jesus meant "to be accepted or rejected there."¹³⁸

It is clear that Jesus directed His mission only to Israel. The reason for His doing so is also obvious. He came to fulfill Jewish religious tradition. The question remains, Did our Lord contemplate His ministry as being -- in any real sense -- for the Gentiles? The reply, if adequate, must not overlook the fact that Judaism was a missionary religion.¹³⁹ There are in the Marcan source three evidences that Jesus did consider His ministry as being for the Gentiles.

134. See Rawlinson, op. cit., pp. 217ff.

135. Cf. Goguel, op. cit., p. 509.

136. Cf. Knight, op. cit., p. 157.

137. See op. cit., p. 175.

138. Jesus, p. 162.

139. See pp. 51ff., above.

(1) He disclaimed nationalistic messianism. The Messianic office to which our Lord made public claim during Passion Week was spiritual and non-political in character. See pp. 104ff., above. Further there is the obvious reluctance of Jesus to accept the title "Messiah."¹⁴⁰ On the occasions when He was called the Messiah and when it was suggested that He considered Himself to be the Messiah, the record is that He responded by referring to the role of the Son of Man (8:29ff. and 14:61f.).

(2) Mark indicates that three forms of the Messianic concept helped Jesus come to an articulate Messianic self-expression.¹⁴¹ Each included being "a light to the Gentiles" as part of the Messianic function.¹⁴² Prof. W. Manson has listed them with definitive scripture:¹⁴³

- (a) Son of God, whose role is defined at Ps. 2:6-8, where the Davidic Prince, the prototype of Israel's Messiah, is represented as saying: "I was appointed king by Him over Zion His holy mountain... The Lord said to me, 'My Son art thou ... I will give thee the nations as thy inheritance and the bounds of the earth as thy possession.'"
- (b) Suffering Servant, the essence of whose role is stated at Is. 52:13, 53:9: "My Servant shall understand and shall be exalted... and I will give the wicked for his grave... For this reason he shall be the inheritor of many and shall divide the spoils of the strong."
- (c) Son of Man, whose function is depicted in the vision at Dan. 7:13f. "Lo, on the clouds of heaven came one as a son of man... and there was given to him authority, and all the nations of the earth... and all glory doing him honor."

140. Goguel perceives at John 6:15 our Lord's rejection of an attempt to force Him to become the Messiah (*op. cit.*, pp. 367-377).

141. The Marcan evidence for our Lord's consciousness of Sonship to God has been listed above, pp. 93f. The fact that He referred to Himself as Son of Man has also been indicated. There are at least twelve such references in Mark. (See T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, pp. 214f.) Evidence that the ideal of the Suffering Servant was present to the mind of Jesus has been noted in discussing Jesus' sacrifice.

142. Contra J. Klausner, Jesus of Nazareth, pp. 199f.

143. *Op. cit.*, p. 99.

(3) The teaching of Our Lord includes explicit reference to Gentiles entering the malkuth. At this point the parable of the mustard seed (4:30-32) is of particular interest. Being reported independently in Q (Lk. 13:18-19),¹⁴⁴ its genuineness would seem assured. *μικροτέρων ... γῆς* (verse 31b) disturbs the grammar of the sentence¹⁴⁵ and probably represents the evangelist's interpretation of the parable. The emphasis on the smallness of the seed is absent in Q.¹⁴⁶ As Prof. Dodd pointed out, the idea which "belongs to the earliest tradition is that of growth up to the point at which the tree can shelter birds." This idea is logically the clue to the original application.¹⁴⁷ The concept obviously refers to Old Testament passages¹⁴⁸ in which a tree sheltering birds is a symbol of a world empire protecting its subject-people. The meaning of the parable is clear: Jesus predicted that the growth of the malkuth would eventually bring the Gentiles into its care.¹⁴⁹

The same thought is present at 13:10 and 14:9:

"And the gospel must first be preached *εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*."
 "Wherever the gospel is preached *εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον* what she has done will be told in memory of her."

144. Mt. 13:31f. is a conflation of Mark and Q. See Kilpatrick, *op. cit.*, p. 10; cf. Streeter, *op. cit.*, pp. 246f.

145. Cf. Wellhausen, *op. cit.*, p. 37. "Diese Konstruktion ... nicht sinnngemass."

146. Mt. 13:32a, *ὁ μικροτέρων... σπερμάτων*, is Marcan.

147. *The Parables of the Kingdom*, p. 190.

148. E.g., Ezek. 17:22ff.; Dan. 4:10ff., 21.

149. Cf. T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, p. 133, fn. 1. Prof. Dodd interprets the parable according to the principle that the malkuth is a harvest and concludes that Jesus is asserting that the blessings of the malkuth are now available to all men (*op. cit.*, p. 191). But the probabilities are against this interpretation. It was Jesus' sacrifice which made the blessings of the malkuth available to the "many." See below, p. 113.

The genuineness of these sayings has been challenged on several counts. (i) Jesus expected the Parousia to be imminent. (ii) The sayings represent the conviction of the missionaries to the Gentiles and are phrased in the missionary vocabulary of the Gentile Church.¹⁵⁰ (iii) It is urged that the actions of Peter and the others at Antioch are inconsistent with the sayings.¹⁵¹ The force of these arguments admitted, it is still unnecessary to conclude with Loisy that these verses are de facto creations of the Church.¹⁵² (i) Jesus' expectation of the Parousia within a generation (9:1) would not necessarily preclude these sayings. The apostle Paul believed in both the imminence of the Parousia and world missions. His world (and that of Jesus) was the Roman world. (ii) Sayings which represent Church policy may be open to suspicion thereby, but the mere fact that they coincide with Church interest does not prove the suspicion. It would be more logical to conclude that sayings inspired Church policy. There is no reason why Jesus could not have consciously held before Himself the evangelical program of some of the Old Testament prophets: Israel, and through Israel, the world.¹⁵³ (iii) The question before the early Church and that which precipitated the ignominious action of Peter at Antioch was not the rightness of the Gentile mission but rather the conditions of admission of Gentiles into the fellowship.¹⁵⁴ It is probable that these verses are no more than ex

150. See Rawlinson, op. cit., pp. 185 and 198.

151. E.g., McNeile, op. cit., p. 347.

152. Op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 413f. and 497.

153. Cf. Blunt, op. cit., p. 237.

154. See p. 23, above.

post facto recasts of the words of Jesus.¹⁵⁵

The mature thought of our Lord seems to be expressed in the oracles which refer the benefits of His sacrifice to the "many." "The Son of Man also came ... to give His life as a ransom ἡ ὑποπόσπονδος" (10:45). "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out ἐπὶ πολλῶν" (14:24). Other sayings -- in Mark and in the other sources -- express an interest in the Gentiles, but do not indicate what makes the malkuth available to the Gentiles. The phrase "for many" is an echo of Is. 53:11-12, where the salvation of the Gentiles is dependent upon the perishing of the servant. As Dalman noted, "The 'many' is meant to give an impression of the greatness of the future achievement of the Servant of God."¹⁵⁶ Jesus' thought as He contemplated His sacrifice seems to echo Is. 49:6,

"It is too light a thing that thou shouldest be My Servant
to raise up the tribes of Jacob,
And to restore the preserved of Israel;
I will give thee as a light to the nations,
That My salvation may reach to the ends of the earth."

^ and
bring
them
His death would deliver the Gentiles into the fellowship of the
grace of God.

It remains to note that the mission assigned to the disciples (6:7ff.)¹⁵⁷ was of such a character as not to preclude the Great Commission as part of the Resurrection Experience.

155. Cf. Blunt, op. cit., ad. loc.; Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 198.

156. Jesus-Jeshua, p. 172.

157. Wellhausen considers the mission as symbolical and not historical (Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien, p. 140). But the "few laborers" of Lk. 10:2/Mt. 9:37f. (Q) indicates that others were proclaiming the presence of the malkuth. And there is no reason why Jesus should not have sent the Twelve on a mission tour of Galilee. See further, Rawlinson, op. cit., pp. 76f.

C. THE JUDGMENT OF JESUS ON JUDAISM AND THE GENTILES

The question stated by Harnack and considered in the immediately preceding pages is not the most significant one for our study. Judaism had been a universal religion for several centuries before our Lord appeared. His vision of Gentiles in the malkuth is not in the least incongruous with the vision of the great prophets or even of Pharisaic Judaism. The rightness of pagans entering into the faith of Israel was not questioned.

The query which we must consider is, "On what terms shall Gentiles be brought into the orbit of the covenant privileges?" This is the question which split the early Church. There is no record that words of Jesus healed the breach. Thus it has been suggested that Jesus did not speak apropos to this question.¹⁵⁸ This judgment is hardly admissible in light of the fact that He so clearly perceived the Gentiles entering the malkuth. There are several indications in Mark that our Lord Himself considered and answered this question -- at least indirectly.

(1) Mark reports that Jesus perceived Himself to be the object of loyalty due to God.

"For whoever is ashamed of Me and My words in this adulterous generation, of him will the Son of Man also be ashamed when he comes in the glory of his Father with the holy angels" (8:38).¹⁵⁹

Two factors attest the authenticity of this saying. (i) It is reported independently by Q.¹⁶⁰ (ii) It suggests a distinction between the person of Jesus and that of the future judge, a dis-

158. Foakes Jackson and Lake, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 317.

159. Following the text of A. Huck, op. cit., p. 99. Many MSS. omit "and my words."

160. Lk. 12:8f./Mt. 10:32f. Cf. Rawlinson, op. cit., p. 116.

inction which the Church would not have made.¹⁶¹ Nevertheless, Bultmann, impressed by the suggestion here (and elsewhere) of a distinction between Jesus and the Son of Man insists that Jesus never invited faith in Himself as the "Messiah."¹⁶² Against this judgment it must be urged that since Jesus saw the malkuth of God uniquely present in His work "he cannot but have, sooner or later, thought of the Son of Man as foreshadowed in himself."¹⁶³ The daring self-consciousness of our Lord led Him to identify God's presence with His person and ministry,¹⁶⁴ to offer His teaching as God's will,¹⁶⁵ and to promise to all who received Himself and His message entrance into the malkuth.

(2) Jesus passed critical judgment upon contemporary Judaism. In Mark there are two facets of this indictment. (a) He bitterly condemned the scribes and Pharisees, the most zealous patrons of the ceremonial and ritual code of Judaism. Montefiore, Herford, and Abrahams have vigorously protested against the severity of Jesus' condemnation of the Rabbis, whose goodness is attested by their recorded sayings¹⁶⁶ and by anecdotes told about some of them. These scholars do not clearly perceive the fundamental basis of the indictment. The conflict between our Lord and the Rabbis was fundamentally a conflict between two distinct types of religion.¹⁶⁷ Consummately zealous for the observance of the detailed provisions of the Law, the scribes and Pharisees were blind to the presence of the malkuth (8:12). Confronted with the Kingdom of God, they would

161. Note the substitution of "I" for "Son of Man" at Mt. 10:32. Cf. Otto, op. cit., pp. 163f.

162. Das Urchristentum, p. 100.

163. W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p. 66.

164. See, above, pp. 96f., and below, pp. 129f., 150ff., 166f.

165. See, above, p. 85, and below, pp. 126, 145, 164.

166. Taylor, The Sayings of the Jewish Fathers.

167. Major, op. cit., p. 154.

not enter it themselves and prevented others from doing so (8:13-21; 12:38-40). Thus the malkuth would be taken from them and given to others (12:9). The logical implication of this indictment is that their devotion to the Religion of the Book barred the Pharisees from accepting God's revelation.

(b) Jesus considered some forms of Jewish piety as means to worship but not necessarily essential to religious devotion.

"Do you see these great buildings? There will not be left here one stone upon another, that will not be thrown down" (13:2).

"We heard Him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another, not made with hands" (14:58; cf. 15:29).

There can be no reasonable doubt that our Lord foresaw the destruction of the Temple. The prediction is too well authenticated in tradition. Moreover, in doing so Jesus had to exercise nothing more than prophetic consciousness.¹⁶⁸ Yet, it would seem that our Lord's thought as He anticipated the fall of the Temple went beyond any recorded prophetic insight. The Old Testament prophet envisaged a restored and purified Temple.¹⁶⁹ However, the words "another (Temple), not made with hands,"¹⁷⁰ promises something entirely different. The oracle indicates a service of God in opposition to that with which Israel was acquainted, and which the Torah sanctified -- "one is almost compelled to say a new religion instead of the old."¹⁷¹ Jesus did not condemn the Temple and its sacrifice, but He did foresee its displacement.

168. See Jer. 7:14.

169. See Ezek. 40ff.

170. The authenticity of these words can not be easily set aside. They are substantially reported by two other independent traditions. See Acts 6:14 and John 2:19. The words allude to Hosea 6:2.

171. Otto, op. cit., p. 62.

It could very well be that Jesus anticipated the displacement of other institutions of Jewish piety. Mark interpreted the parables of the old and new

"No one sews a piece of unshrunk cloth on an old garment;
If he does, the patch tears away from it,
The new from the old,
And a worse tear is made.
And no one puts new wine into old wineskins;
If he does, the wine will burst the skins,
And the wine is lost,
And so are the skins" (2:21-22)

as predicting that forms of Judaism were outmoded. There is, however, a singular objection to the evangelist's interpretation of them. The Church was loyal to the Jewish ceremonial code for a generation. But against this objection it can be urged that the fidelity of the nascent Church to Jewish forms can be accounted for by its desire to proselytize Jewry and by its lack of insight into the teaching of Jesus. On the whole, evidence would seem to indicate that the Marcan interpretation is not unwarranted. Jesus perceived His ministry to be the beginning of a new era (3:24-27).¹⁷² In conducting His ministry He waived claims of Jewish social and religious customs.¹⁷³ Further, He urged the ignorant and careless am- ha- aretz simply to receive τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. And as just noted, He predicted the end of Temple worship with the destruction of the Temple. The judgment of Principal Major that "Jesus indicates here (Mk. 2:21-22) His conviction that His Gospel cannot be contained within the limits of Jewish legalism"¹⁷⁴ is not improbable. To interpret 2:21-22 thus is not to aver that our Lord condemned Jewish ritual and form as unworthy in themselves,¹⁷⁵ but to urge

172. Cf. Lk. 7:28, 10:23f., 11:31f., 16:16.

173. Eg., the Sabbath observance, fasting, purity.

174. Op. cit., pp. 55f.

175. As Smith has pointed out, the parables do not say that the new is better than the old (op. cit., ad. loc.).

only that He predicted that they would pass from the religious scene.¹⁷⁶

One is almost compelled to say, to use the words of Rudolf Otto, that in the new era there would be a new religion -- not unrelated to Judaism but rather the fulfillment of it, and yet as the fulfillment of Judaism -- distinct from Judaism.

(3) Our Lord responded to the faith of the non-Jew in the presence and power of God. This fact does not receive as explicit attestation in Mark as it does in Q. Yet, it is indicated in the Syrophoenician incident.¹⁷⁷ Moreover, the predictions of the Gentile missions (13:10, 14:9) imply that Jesus appreciated faith in the Gentiles. The inference here as in our Lord's ministry to the am- ha- aretz is that Jesus considered faith to be the sole requisite for entrance into the malkuth.¹⁷⁸

It seems certain that Jesus held the ideal of a missionary nation for Israel.¹⁷⁹ Reformed by His ministry Judaism would offer a truly universal faith to the nations

176. Cf. Bowman, op. cit., p. 302.

177. See, above, pp. 103-105.

178. Only in M is there any suggestion that Jesus urged His followers to Pharisaic devotion to the cultural ethos. And Mt. 23:2f. and 5:19 are suspect.

179. Cf. C. J. Cadoux, The Historic Mission of Jesus, p. 161.

CHAPTER V. JUDAISM AND THE GENTILES IN THE MINISTRY OF JESUS:
II. THE Q SOURCE

Material common to the Matthean and the Lucan gospels and not found in the Marcan gospel is generally referred to as Q among scholars in the English-speaking world.¹⁷⁶

The Q source has several noteworthy characteristics. Void of narrative,¹⁷⁷ it is a record of the *Λόγοι Ἰησοῦ*. It presupposes the Messiahship of Jesus from beginning to end as it does the mighty works (*δυνάμεις*). Its horizon and its sentiment are Jewish. The Kingdom of God is a "feast with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob" (Lk. 13:28f./Mt. 8:11f.). Yet, it is without bias. The purpose of Q appears to be threefold: (a) exhortation to the disciples, (b) warning to the Jews, and (c) invitation to the Gentiles.¹⁷⁸

Q was originally written in Aramaic. The apostle Matthew probably wrote it¹⁷⁹ in Antioch not later than A. D. 50.¹⁸⁰ It ranks along with Mark as a source of primary value for the teaching of Jesus.

A. JESUS' ATTITUDE TOWARD JUDAISM

It is convenient to group the relevant material under the two subheadings which were used in considering the Marcan material.

176. B. W. Bacon was a notable exception.

177. Cf. T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, pp. 27ff.

178. Op. cit., p. 33.

179. Papias' statement that "Matthew composed the oracles (*τὰ λόγια*) in the Hebrew language, and each one interpreted them as he was able" (quoted by Eusebius, H. E. iii. 39. 16) cannot refer to the First Gospel. *τὰ λόγια* probably refers to our source Q. See Harnack, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 249; Streeter, op. cit., ad. loc.; T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 27.

180. See T. W. Manson, The Life of Jesus: A Survey of Available Materials: The Fourth Gospel (Reprint from Ryl. Bul., XXX, no. 2, 1947), p. 20; Cf. Streeter, op. cit.; W. Manson, Luke, p. xvii.

First, there is Jesus' use of Scripture. Reference has been made in investigating the Marcan evidence to Jesus' profound and extensive knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures. Q contains some twelve references by our Lord to Old Testament passages.¹⁸¹ In ascertaining the character of Jesus' appeal to the Torah as recorded in Q, we can find some indication in our Lord's use of the scribal formula, gegraptai. On one occasion Jesus asked His inquirer, "What γέγραπται in the Law?" This passage is discussed p. 123, below. On five other occasions He appealed to Scripture using the scribal formula. Four of these quotations are found in the record of the Temptation.¹⁸²

"And Jesus answered him, γέγραπται, Man shall not live by bread alone" (Lk. 4:4/Mt. 4:4, quoting Deut. 8:3).

"And Jesus answered him, γέγραπται, You shall worship the Lord your God, and him only shall you serve" (Lk. 4:8/Mt. 4:10, quoting Deut. 6:13).

"For γέγραπται,
He will give his angels charge of you, to guard you, and
On their hands they will bear you up,
lest you strike a foot against a stone"
(Lk. 4:10f./Mt. 4:6, quoting Ps. 91:11f.).¹⁸³

"And Jesus answered him, γέγραπται (Lk. ἔϊρηται), You shall not tempt the Lord your God" (Lk 4:12/Mt 4:7, quoting Deut. 6:16).

The fifth is found in the passage appraising the Baptist:

"This is he of whom γέγραπται,
Behold, I send my messenger before thy face,
who shall prepare thy way before thee"
(Lk. 7:27/Mt. 11:10, quoting Mal. 3:1).

181. Cf. T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 48, fn. 1.

182. The writer considers the Temptation Experience to have been an historical fact in the life of Jesus following upon the Baptismal experience and subsequently related to the disciples.

183. Assuming that the Devil's quotation was a reflection in the mind of our Lord.

The general indications of this use of gegraptai are the same as those found in the Marcan usage. Jesus did not appeal to the Torah as a final arbitrary authority to whose prescriptions He must subscribe. Rather He found Scripture as prophetic of the ministry of John the Baptist and discovered in it inspiration and principles which guided His own ministry.

Several Q passages illustrate our Lord's use of and regard for the Torah.

(1) Luke 16:16-18. There are several striking differences between verse 16,

"The Law and the prophets were until John; since then the good news of the Kingdom of God is preached, and every one enters it violently,"

and its parallel (Mt. 11:12-13),

"From the days of John the Baptist until now the Kingdom of heaven has suffered violence, and men of violence take it by force."

The saying probably should read¹⁸⁴

"The Law and the prophets were until John; since that time the Kingdom of God exercises its power and men of violence snatch at it."¹⁸⁵

184. The Lucan form shows evidence of the editor's hand. Two key words, εὐαγγελίσσασθαι (which occurs ten times in Luke and only once elsewhere in the gospels - Mt. 11:5), and πᾶς (which represents a subtle Lucan emphasis on the universality of the Gospel) are editorial. This evidence along with the greater difficulty of the form in Matthew has brought the judgment that the Matthean form is more original. See Creed, op. cit., pp. 206f. But the Matthean form is not without signs of editorial activity. "From the days of John" suggests that either the evangelist is speaking or Christ is speaking on another occasion. "The Kingdom of heaven βιάζεται" must refer to the death of the Baptist and to persecution of Christians. Further, there is reason to prefer the Lucan order of the clauses. πάντες is a favorite Matthean gloss and ἐπρόφητευσαν is awkward as it stands in verse 13.

185. Following Otto, op. cit., pp. 108-112; cf. T. W. Manson, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 426.

Out of context this saying might be interpreted as meaning that the Torah has lost its value as a revelation of God's will. The context, however, indicates a less extreme and more probable interpretation of Jesus' original words. The oracle contrasts two periods in history separated by the ministry of John the Baptist: a) the period of the Law and the prophets and b) the period of the malkuth of God. There is abundant evidence to corroborate the consciousness of our Lord expressed here that the aeon of the malkuth is markedly different from all previous history. See Lk. 7:28/Mt. 11:11 and Lk. 11:20/Mt. 12:28. As Principal Duncan has observed, Jesus was conscious that His ministry was translating prophecy into history.¹⁸⁶ Further, it is evident that Jesus considered the detailed prescriptions of the Torah as superseded by the claims of the malkuth. In this connection note the Sabbath controversies¹⁸⁷ and Jesus' association with the am- ha- aretz.¹⁸⁸ If we consider our Lord's use of Scripture, it follows that Jesus considered the period of the Torah as the final authority to be at an end but not the period of its usefulness.

Prima facie verse 17 is perplexing.

"But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away
than for one dot of the Law to become void."

If one accepts the usual interpretation of the word "dot,"¹⁸⁹ this saying depicts Jesus as affirming the absolute eternity of the Law in its minutest details.¹⁹⁰ Such a portrait is impossible. Jesus'

186. Jesus, The Son of Man, p. 99.

187. See pp. 91f., above, and pp. 148f., 164ff., below.

188. See pp. 88ff., 98, above, and pp. 131, 147f., 152f., 167, below.

189. Namely, that it means the serif which distinguishes certain letters of the Hebrew alphabet as it distinguishes G from C in English.

190. Cf. Creed, op. cit., p. 207.

respect of the Torah was not scribal in character. His use of it was creative and dynamic.

The Matthean form of this saying (5:18),

"For truly, I say to you, till heaven and earth pass away, not an iota, not a dot will pass from the Law until all is accomplished,"

claims less for the perpetuity of the Law. However, it conforms exactly with the Rabbinical doctrine that the Torah remains in full validity throughout the present age and the Messianic period.¹⁹¹ Thus it is not unlikely that the Matthean form is a revision of the original saying of Jesus.¹⁹²

Prof. T. W. Manson has in the light of these difficulties proposed that the Lucan form of the saying must be interpreted as bitter irony, asserting not the perpetuity of the Law but rather the unyielding conservatism of the scribes. This interpretation is supported by the probable meaning of the word "dot," i.e. certain scribal ornaments added to certain letters in the Hebrew Scriptures.¹⁹³ The saying thus comes to mean: "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for the scribes to give up the smallest bit of that tradition by which they make the Law of none effect."¹⁹⁴

Verse 18 is the Q teaching on divorce.

"Everyone who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery, and he who marries a woman divorced from her husband commits adultery."

Jesus' teaching here is fundamentally the same as reported in Mark

191. See Moore, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 269ff.

192. For the Matthean tendency to conform teachings of Jesus to Rabbinical doctrines compare Mt. 5:32 with Lk. 16:18 and see p. 72, fn. 75, above.

193. See Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., vol. 1. pp. 248f.

194. T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 427.

(10:11). He disallowed a permission of the Torah, namely, the right of man to put away his wife if he found "any unseemly thing" (צ'ל'י' א'ר'י' 77) in her, providing he gave her a bill of divorcement (Deut. 24:1-3). For a man to divorce his wife under any circumstance, Jesus contended, is to commit adultery. And in doing so, He redefined adultery.¹⁹⁵ Jewish law defined adultery as intercourse between a married woman and a man other than her husband.¹⁹⁵ Thus although a woman could commit adultery against her husband, a man could not commit adultery against his wife but only against another man. But Jesus insisted that man could commit adultery against his wife.¹⁹⁷

(2) Lk. 10:25-28; cf. Mt. 22:35-40, where Matthew has followed Mark (12:28-34) but introduced reminiscences of Q.¹⁹⁸ A scribe inquired of Jesus, "Teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" Our Lord in reply asked, "What is written in the Torah?" The scribe answered by quoting two passages from the Pentateuch: "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your strength" (Deut. 6:5) and "your neighbor as yourself" (Lev. 19:18).

195. See Moore, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 128, fn. 1.

196. In construing the Law formal betrothal was regarded as the equivalent of marriage.

197. Cf. T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 427.

198. This passage is often considered secondary and editorial. But it must be urged that the Marcan parallel is different. The question asked is different, and the combining of the principles of love to God and man are assigned to different persons. Most persuasive, however, are the points of contact between Luke and Matthew against Mark: καὶ, νομικός, (ἐκ) περιέγων αὐτόν· διδάσκαλε in verse 25 (Mt. verses 35f.); ἐν τῷ νόμῳ in verse 26 (Mt. verse 35); ὁ δὲ and the three ἐν's with the dative in verse 27 (Mt. verse 37) against Mark's three ἐκ's with the genitive. These words except for νομικός are all cited by Harnack as belonging to the vocabulary of Q (op. cit., pp. 147ff.). "The contacts are too numerous for accidents, especially as this is the only appearance of νομικός in Mt." (B. S. Easton, St. Luke, p. 169). But Streeter rejected νομικός from the Matthean text (op. cit., p. 320).

(3) Lk. 11:42 (Mt. 23:23).

"But woe to you Pharisees! For you tithe mint and rue and every herb, and neglect justice and the love of God; these you ought to have done without neglecting the others."

The differences between the two accounts are not pertinent here. The point of interest in this verse is that the latter half depicts Jesus as condoning an extreme legalistic scrupulosity in tithing. The text is suspect on two grounds: a) The fact that both the text of Marcion and Codex Bezae omit this clause from Luke suggests the possibility that the clause in Luke may be an interpolation from Matthew. b) There is no evidence that mint was subject to tithe and there is definite evidence that rue was not.¹⁹⁹ Even if the text be retained, it is psychologically and historically impossible to portray Jesus, the friend of publicans and sinners, as enjoining such minute and detailed accuracy in tithing.²⁰⁰ Nonetheless, the whole force of the rebuke is consistent with the approach of our Lord. He did not seek to destroy the Torah, but to fulfill it. He did not minimize religious obligations but maximized them. The oracle would suggest that Jesus is asserting that acts of supererogation are not enough. One should do more than religious laws demand. But in all that one does, he must seek to "do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly with God." Sacrifice is not enough; there must be justice and mercy.

(4) Lk. 6:27f. (Mt. 5:44, 39).

"But I say to you that hear,
 Love your enemies,
 do good to them that hate you,
 bless those who curse you,
 pray for those who abuse you."

199. Shebi'ith 9:1, quoted by Danby, Mishnah, p. 49.

200. See further, Branscomb, Jesus and the Law of Moses, pp. 212f.

In contrast to the limiting rules discovered in the Torah by normative Judaism are the creative principles which our Lord found. The spiritual demand of the Torah has no limitations. Love even the enemy.

Conclusions from these passages are essentially the same as those reached in the study of Marcan passages. Jesus did not attack the Law. He did find the letter of the Law to be permissive and defective. But this He declared by indirection. Rather He claimed to set His own interpretations upon the commandments of the Torah and offer them as authoritative declarations of the will of God.

Second, there is Jesus' attitude to the Jewish ceremonial law. Two sayings are pertinent at this point.

(1) "Leave the dead to bury their own dead" (Lk. 9:60/Mt. 8:21). The Lucan text is preferred over the Matthean,²⁰¹ but the extra clause, "Go and proclaim..." which has no parallel in Matthew, probably does not belong to Q.²⁰² The saying has to be observed over against the high Jewish duty of giving burial to the dead, especially to near relatives.²⁰³ The seeming harshness of it has led to the proposal that the Aramaic has been misinterpreted and that what Jesus said was something like "Leave the dead to the burier of the dead."²⁰⁴ There are two difficulties with

201. The word "first" comes very awkwardly in Matthew. Moreover, the words "Follow me" are more in place in the Lucan context.

202. *Scappéto* is found here only in the Gospels. It is also found at Acts 21:26 and may be Lucan.

203. Giving proper burial to one's father is conceived as a primary duty of filial piety at Tobit 4:3, 6:15 (quoted by Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., vol. 4, pp. 578f.).

204. Abrahams, op. cit., 2nd series, pp. 183f.

this solution. a) The son would be the natural and proper person to see to the burial of his father. b) It strains in making a distinction between the spiritually and physically dead. The utterance is rather a paradoxical way of saying: "That business must look after itself; you have more important work to do."²⁰⁵ Filial duty must yield to the higher claim of the malkuth.

(2) Lk. 11:39-41; cf. Mt. 23:25f.

"And the Lord said to him, Now you Pharisees cleanse the outside of the cup and the dish but inside you are full of extortion and wickedness. You fool! Did not he who made the outside make the inside also? But give for alms those things which are within; and behold, everything is clean for you."

This saying clearly came down through a double tradition. The Matthean form is a conflation of Q and M.²⁰⁶ The Lucan form is obscure at verse 41 and needs emendation. Wellhausen has suggested that Luke's "give for alms" (תְּתַתְּ) is a mistaken rendering of an Aramaic original more correctly translated by Matthew.²⁰⁷ The saying thus concludes: "But cleanse (תְּקַדְּשׁ) what is within; and behold, everything is clean for you."²⁰⁸ The meaning of the oracle becomes: form and ritual are insignificant without justice, mercy, and humility; conversely these weightier matters of the Torah are completely sufficient. "Purify the inside, and then all is pure for you," that is to say, if the heart is pure, the whole man is pure.²⁰⁹

205. T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 365; cf. Branscomb, op. cit., pp. 193-198.

206. Streeter, op. cit., pp. 253f.

207. Das Evangelium Luc, p. 61.

208. C. H. Torrey rejected Wellhausen's solution because of the slight evidence that zakki ever meant "give alms." In his view the Aramaic original was תְּקַדְּשׁ "make righteous." This view reaches the same conclusion as that stated above. See Studies in the History of Religions (Presented to C. H. Toy), edited by Lyon and Moore, pp. 312f.

209. T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 561.

Conclusions from these passages are similar to those reached in the study of Marcan passages. Jesus set aside the most sacred earthly obligations as subordinate to divine claims. He considered formal requirements of the ceremonial and ritual code of Judaism as incidental.

B. THE EXPRESSED MISSION OF JESUS AND HIS DISCIPLES

Reference to the fact that the mission of Jesus was based on His unique consciousness has already been made. Q corroborates the witness to this unique consciousness. "Go and tell John what you have seen and heard" (Lk. 7:22/ Mt. 11:4). "If it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons, then the Kingdom of God has come upon you" (Lk. 11:20/Mt. 12:28).

More important Q intimates that the consciousness of our Lord was uniquely that of Son to God. The most important Q passage to this effect, Lk. 10:21-22 (Mt. 11:25-27), is unique to the synoptic record.

"In that same hour He rejoiced in the Holy Spirit and said, I thank Thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that Thou hast hidden these things from the wise and understanding and revealed them to babes: yea, Father, for such was Thy gracious will. All things have been delivered to Me by My Father; and no one knows who the Son is except the Father, or who the Father is except the Son and any one to whom the Son chooses to reveal Him."

The authenticity of this saying is frequently challenged. Form critics deem it a product of the Christian community.²¹⁰ Textual critics find problems attendant upon the received text. The texts of several early Church Fathers²¹¹ differ from the received text at two important points: i) *ἐγώ* replaces *γινώσκετε* and ii) the

210. See Dibelius, *op. cit.*, p. 282; Bultmann, *Geschichte*, p. 199; and Arvedson, *Das Mystrium Christi*, pp. 229f.

211. E.g., Justin, Marcion, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius.

clauses, to know "the Son except the Father" and to know "the Father except the Son" are transposed. i) Several considerations suggest that *γινώσκει* might well be an accommodation to theology and worship. a) Jesus' knowledge of God as Father took place in time. b) There is apparent no forceful reason why any one would change *γινώσκει* to *ἔγνων*. c) *ἔγνων* seems to be required by the series of aorists (*ἐκρύψας, ἀπεκάλυψας, ἐγένετο, παρεδόθη*). ii) The transposing of the clauses, to know "the Son..." and to know "the Father...", in the texts of early Church Fathers has caused some scholars (James Denny, a notable exception) to regard one or the other clause as an interpolation. Von Harnack, urging that the concern of the passage at its beginning and end is with knowing the Father, reconstructed the text to omit *καὶ οὐδεὶς... ὁ υἱὸς ... ὁ πατήρ*²¹² Easton (contra Harnack) pointed out the fact that the clause, *καὶ ... ὁ πατήρ... ὁ υἱὸς*, enunciates the basic principle of the mystery religions and reconstructed the logion omitting it.²¹³ These reconstructions underline the probability that the final form of this saying was influenced by Christian theology and worship. Yet, there is evidence that the logion not improbably originated on the lips of Jesus.²¹⁴ The tenor of the whole saying is simply "that God has unveiled the Messianic secret to Jesus and, through him, to his humble followers."²¹⁵ That our Lord was conscious of bringing men a revelation of transcendent importance is indubitable.²¹⁶ Likewise there is evidence that Jesus deemed recognition of His Messianic role to be a product of divine grace.²¹⁷ Moreover, it is incontestable that our Lord's Messianic consciousness was intrinsically linked with His awareness of Sonship to God.²¹⁸ There is apparent no strong reason to doubt that Jesus, in an ecstatic moment such as that induced by the confession of Peter (Mk. 8:29),²¹⁹ proclaimed in the presence of His disciples His gratitude to God at the revelation of His Messianic role to them, and in so doing openly expressed His filial consciousness to God.

212. The Sayings of Jesus, pp. 292ff.

213. Op. cit., pp. 166f.

214. Cf. W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p. 175.

215. W. Manson, Luke, p. 129.

216. Note Lk. 11:31/Mt. 12:41-42, Lk. 10:23f./Mt. 13:16f.

218. See W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p. 109; Harnack, op. cit., p. 245.

217. Clearly stated at Mt. 16:17.

219. Following T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, pp. 110; cf. W. Manson, op. cit. pp. 108f.

Two other factors in Q attest Jesus' consciousness of unique Sonship. (1) The temptation experience (Lk. 4:1-13/Mt. 4:1-11). These accounts probably incorporated symbolical features.²¹⁹ Yet, temptation in the desert seems to have been a real fact in the life of Jesus.²²⁰ And it seems certain that at this time He pre-cognized the subsequent issues of His work.²²¹ The requisite basis of this experience was the Bath Qol, "You are My Son."²²²

(2) The references to God as Father. The Q evidence corresponds to that of Mark, namely, that Jesus referred to God as Father sparingly (Q has the word "Father" for God nine times)²²³ and that these references were almost exclusively addressed to the disciples after the Petrine confession.²²⁴ One Q parable implies the Fatherhood of God (Lk. 11:11f./Mt. 7:9f.). As was noted with regard to Mark, this would indicate that the Fatherhood of God was for Jesus no theological commonplace but a genuine experience.

The Q source contains a very explicit note as to the purpose of our Lord's ministry. *καὶ οὐδεὶς.. τὸν πατέρα ἐπιγίνωσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὃ βούλεται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψει.*²²⁵ He sought to reveal the fulness of life which was His as Son to the

219. There are features which recall the Exodus experience of Israel and the experiences of Moses and Elijah as well.

220. Cf. Loisy, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 427f.

221. Note the certainty with which He faced the issues of His ministry. Cf. W. Manson, Luke, p. 39.

222. All three synoptic gospels have an inner connection between baptism and temptation. Cf. Creed, op. cit., p. 62; McNeile, op. cit., p. 37. It is interesting that Harnack (op. cit., pp. 312f.) and Streeter concluded that Q had an account of the Baptism.

223. Lk. 6:36, 10:21, 10:22, 11:13, 12:30, 12:32.

224. See T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 95.

225. Mt. 11:27 (Lk. 10:22). The textual differences between Mt. and Lk. are not critical here. *τὸν πατέρα* and *τις ἐστὶν ὁ πατήρ* must refer to the nature of God. Both *γινώσκει* and *ἐπιγίνωσκει* are used in the LXX to render *יָדַעַ*, which is used in the Old Syriac and Peshitta in translation of Mt. 11:27 and Lk. 10:22.

Father, to extend the fellowship within the spirit of God. Q indicates four phases of activity engaged in by Jesus that men might enter the malkuth and its righteousness. It has no reference to the Passion.

(1) Jesus proclaimed the presence of the malkuth. "The Kingdom of God has come near" (Lk. 10:11b). "Then the Kingdom of God has come upon you" (Lk. 11:20b/Mt. 12:28b). "Since then the Kingdom of God is preached" (Lk. 16:16b). Those who respond favorably to this preaching enter into God's reign and thus enjoy a more fruitful relation with God than that of the prophets of old (Lk. 7:28/Mt. 11:17).²²⁶ They enter into the redemptive era toward which the prophets could only look.²²⁷

(2) Jesus performed mighty works. Q does not record them, but it does presuppose them. "Go and tell John what you have heard and seen: the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear" (Lk. 7:22/Mt. 11:4). The revelational significance of the miracles for Jesus has been noted. They were to Him evidence of God's presence and power. "If it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons, then the Kingdom of God has come upon you" (Lk. 11:20/Mt. 12:28). Our Lord expected others to experience in His mighty works the love of God, to repent and enter the malkuth.²²⁸

(3) Jesus consorted with religious outcasts. Q attests His reputation as a "friend of publicans and sinners" (Lk. 7:34/Mt.

226. Cf. Lk. 16:16.

227. Jesus did not disparage previous revelations of God. But it is a marked characteristic of His consciousness that He was aware of bringing a unique revelation of God's will and that those who accepted this ἀποκάλυψις were blessed. See Lk. 10:23f., 11:31f.

228. See Lk. 10:13 (Mt. 11:21).

11:19). The parable of the lost sheep (Lk. 15:4-7/Mt. 8:10-14) relates to this friendship. Spoken either to encourage the outcasts or to justify Jesus' ministry to them,²²⁹ the parable reflects what was new in our Lord's teaching, namely, that sinners should not be merely mourned for but brought into God's fellowship.²³⁰

(4) Jesus called disciples. The evidence in Q shows the same dual purpose in the appointment of associates as was noted in the Marcan source. a) They shared the fulness of His life. They entered more completely into His experience of the power of God and this experience made them "blessed" (Lk. 10:23f./Mt. 13:16f.). It was to them that He referred to God as Father. And He invited them to enter into the experience of sonship to God.²³¹ b) Their discipleship, nonetheless, had the eventual purpose of proclaiming the malkuth and its righteousness (Lk. 10:11). Their missionary endeavors were wrought with momentous significance. If people reject their message, they invite disaster worse than that which will fall on Sodom (Lk. 17:32). But if people heed their ministry, they enter the fellowship of God's spirit.²³²

The Q answer to Harnack's question, Among whom did our Lord seek to create a people of God? is essentially the same as that found in Mark. Jesus directed His ministry only to Israel. He saw in His ministry the malkuth "mightily permeating the dead lump of religious Judaism."²³³ This source gives no evidence of

229. Cf. B. T. D. Smith, op. cit., p. 188.

230. Op. cit., p. 190.

231. Lk. 6:36, 10:21, 10:22, 11:13, 12:30, 12:32.

232. Lk. 10:16/Mt. 10:40.

233. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, pp. 192f. See Lk. 13:20-21/Mt. 13:33. Smith with some reservation interprets the parable to the same effect (op. cit., pp. 122f.).

any ministry on non-Jewish soil.

Yet, there are indications that our Lord considered His ministry to have significance for the Gentiles.

(1) Q intimates that Jesus was influenced by the Messianic concepts of (i) Son of God²³⁴ and (ii) Son of Man,²³⁵ both of which include being "allight to the Gentiles" in the Messianic office.

(2) The temptation narratives indicate that our Lord rejected the nationalistic Messianic ideas of His people as being not divine inspirations but as Satanic perversions of the truth.²³⁶

(3) The teaching of Jesus contains reference to Gentiles in the malkuth. (a) The doubly attested parable of the mustard seed (Lk. 13:18-19) affirms that the growth of the Kingdom would eventually bring the Gentiles into its care.²³⁷ The same thought is present at Lk. 13:28-30/Mt. 8:11-12.²³⁸

(b) Important at this point is the healing of the centurion's servant (Lk. 7:1-10/Mt. 8:5-10, 13). As this incident now stands, it is a story about Jesus. However, it originally was probably a pronouncement story.²³⁹ The narrative framework has the slightest contact in the two accounts as can be readily seen by setting the stories side by side.

Mt. 8:5-10,13

Lk. 7:1-10

5,6. Εἰσέλθοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ εἰς
καφαρναούμ

1. Having finished the Sermon on
the Plain Jesus εἰσῆλθεν εἰς
καφαρναούμ.

234. Note especially Lk. 10:21f.

235. There are eleven trustworthy references to Jesus as Son of Man in Q. See T. W. Manson, op. cit., pp. 215ff.

236. Cf. W. Manson, Luke, ad. loc.

237. See p. 110, above.

238. See pp. 140f., below.

239. V. Taylor, Formation of the Gospel Tradition, ad. loc. Dibelius termed it an impure paradigm (op. cit., ad. loc.). Bultmann calls it an apophthegmata (op. cit., p. 28).

an ἑκατόνταρχος came and informed Jesus that his παῖς was critically paralyzed.

7. Jesus promised to go with him and heal the παῖδον.

8. But the centurion protested,

"Lord,

I am not worthy to have you come under my roof;

but only say the word, and my servant will be healed. For I am a man under authority, with soldiers under me; and I say to one, 'Go,' and he goes; and to another, 'Come,' and he comes; and to my servant, 'Do this,' and he does it."

10. Hearing this Jesus marveled and said to those who followed him, "Truly I say to you, not even in Israel have I found such faith."

13. And to the centurion Jesus said, "Go; be it done for you as you have believed." And the servant was healed at that very hour.

2,3. An ἑκατόνταρχος, having a critically sick δοῦλον whom he loved, sent elders of the Jews on the servant's behalf to Jesus.

4,5. The elders made the request, highly commending the centurion.

6-8. Jesus left with them for the centurion's home but was met by friends of the centurion who said for him, "Lord, do not trouble yourself, for I am not worthy to have you come under my roof; therefore I did not presume to come to you. But say the word, and let my servant be healed. For I am a man set under authority, with soldiers under me; and I say to one, 'Go,' and he goes; and to another, 'Come,' and he comes; and to my servant, 'Do this,' and he does it."

9. Hearing this, Jesus marveled at him and said to the multitude which followed him, "I tell you, not even in Israel have I found such faith."

10. When the emissaries returned, they found the servant well.

In the narrative setting there is verbal agreement in only three words, εἰσηλθεν (εἰσελθόντος), καφarnaούμ, ἑκατόνταρχος.

In both narratives the story leads up to the centurion's words.

The evangelist's hand is quite obvious in the Lucan account.²⁴⁰

The Matthean narrative is probably more authentic.²⁴¹ Yet, there are **signs** of the editor's hand in the Matthean account also.²⁴²

240. ἐρωτᾷν (verse 3), παραγίνεσθαι (verse 4), σὺν and πέμπειν (verse 6), τᾶστέιν (verse 8), ὑποστρέφω, πέμπειν, and ὑγαίνειν (verse 10) are Lucan. The participial style of verse 10 is Lucan. μὴ σκύλλου (verse 6) is probably reminiscent of the Jairus story.

241. See Harnack, *op. cit.*, pp. 76f.

242. προτρέχειν (verse 5) is a favorite word of the editor. παρακαλῶν (verse 5) was omitted by the evangelist from 10:2 (Mk. 5:35). Verse 13 appears to be a Matthean cliché. See 15:28 (Mk. 7:30), 9:22 (Mk. 5:34), and 17:18 (Mk. 9:26f.).

It seems almost certain that only the dialogue belonged to Q and that the narrative was supplied independently by "Matthew" and Luke.²⁴³ In any case the dialogue is a complete and self-contained story. And there is nothing incredible in the least.²⁴⁴

The real point of the story is our Lord's commendation of the centurion's faith.²⁴⁵ A Roman centurion, who was apparently a *σεβόμενος*,²⁴⁶ upon asking Jesus to heal his servant insisted that it was only necessary for our Lord to speak in order that his servant be healed.. He drew an analogy between his position of authority and that of Jesus. Explicit in this analogy is "the recognition by the centurion of Jesus as the representative of God, endowed with Divine power and authority."²⁴⁷ Our Lord was impressed with this saying and commented, "Not even in Israel have I found such faith."

This saying of Jesus indicates that He appreciated rare and beautiful faith wherever He encountered it. He expected to find receptive spirits in Israel. Nonetheless, He was receptive to faith in non-Jew as well.

The implication of the above paragraphs is that Jesus confined His ministry to Israel because in His daring self-consciousness He saw His ministry as the fulfillment of the hopes of Israel. His sympathy for the Gentiles (see below, pp. 140ff.) would imply that Jesus thought that Israel regenerated by His ministry

243. Cf. T. W. Manson, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 355.

244. Contra Bultmann, who considers the story to have been a product of Hellenistic Christianity (op. cit., p. 199).

245. Cf. Harnack, op. cit., pp. 210f.; T. W. Manson, op. cit.

246. This is implicit both in the commendation of him at Lk. 7:4f. and in his words to Jesus.

247. T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 357.

would confront the nations with a truly universal faith.²⁴⁸

It remains to note that the Q record of the mission of the disciples (Lk. 10:2ff.) implies that they went only to Israel. But there is present in it no restricting clause which could be dogmatized as prejudicial to the Gentile mission.

C. THE JUDGMENT OF JESUS ON JUDAISM AND THE GENTILES

Q contains three indications that our Lord considered the question, "On what terms shall the Gentiles be brought into the orbit of the covenant privileges?" Cf. Mark, pp. 113ff., above.

(1) Jesus considered Himself to be the object of loyalty due to God.

"And I tell you, every one who acknowledges Me before men, the Son of Man will also acknowledge before the angels of God; but he who denies Me before men will be denied before the angels of God" (Lk. 12:8f./Mt. 10:32f.).²⁴⁹

By accepting Him and His message people received the malkuth and its righteousness.

(2) Jesus was sorrowed by the "tragedy of Israel." Several Q passages are apropos of this theme.

"Salt is good, but if salt has lost its taste, how shall its saltiness be restored? It is fit neither for seasoning²⁵⁰ nor the dunghill, men throw it away" (Lk. 14:34f./Mt. 15:15).

As this parable stands in Luke it is a plea for self-sacrifice. But this use is suspect. It has the appearance of artificiality. Further, the variety of application suggested by the three evangelists shows that the primitive tradition did not know the original

248. Cf. Cadoux, op. cit., p. 161.

249. Concerning the authenticity of this saying see the remarks on the genuineness of Mk. 8:38, pp. 113f., above.

250. Following the very attractive solution of Perles that "land" is a mistaken rendering of the Aramaic word "tabbala" which ought to be translated "seasoning" (cited by T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 424).

application of the parable. It is incumbent to treat it in isolation and attempt to find its original use. We have then what should be a valuable and necessary commodity, except that it has lost its value-giving property. It is worse than useless. What in the ministry of Jesus was in His eyes an example of such tragic loss of value? There is abundant evidence that He saw in the contemporary state of Judaism the deplorable fact of a good and necessary thing irrevocably spoiled and wasted.²⁵¹ This parable seems to have been originally a warning to Israel.²⁵²

Jesus examined Israel and found it wanting. What did Jesus judge to be amiss about Israel?

"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, killing the prophets and stoning those who are sent to you! How often would I have gathered your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, and you would not! Behold your house is forsaken" (Lk. 13:34f./Mt. 23:37ff.).

The holy city itself knew not the source of its glory. Confronted with the $\pi\tau\iota\sigma\tau\eta$ of God it remained unrepentant.

"Woe to you, Chorazin! woe to you, Bethsaida!
For if the mighty works done in you had been
done in Tyre and Sidon,...
And you, Capernaum, will you be exalted to Heaven?
You shall be brought down to Hades"
(Lk. 10:13ff./Mt. 11:21ff.).

Galilean towns also remained unresponsive to great spiritual evidence.

(b) Its religious leaders. One of the most significant passages at this point is the parable of the Messianic Banquet (Lk. 14:15-24; cf. Mt. 22:1-10). Some difficulties in the accounts of the parable must be resolved before its implications are stated.

251. Cf. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, pp. 141f.

252. Cf. T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 454.

The matter common to both the Lucan and Matthean stories may be summarized as follows:²⁵³ A man plans a banquet and issues invitations. The feast being prepared, he despatches his servant (Mt. servants) to announce to his guests the readiness of the banquet. But the guests cancel their acceptance of the invitation, having other business to attend to. The host being justly annoyed, sends out to bring in all and sundry and his house is filled. The Lucan version of the parable is simply a filling in of detail for a vivid and lifelike effect. It has one peculiar feature, the double extension of the open invitation (verses 21 and 23).²⁵⁴ Matthew, on the other hand, introduces new features, which are not at all essential but positively intrusive to the narrative. The feast is a wedding feast given by a king for his son. After the intended guests go about their business, *οἱ λοῖποι* (verse 6) maltreat and kill the king's servants. Consequently the king is angry and despatches his armies which destroy those murderers and burn their city (verse 7). These intrusions either are editorial and based on Rabbinical illustrations of Eccles. 9:8²⁵⁵ or come from a parable akin to that of the wicked husbandmen (Mk. 12:1-10) which the evangelist conflated with the parable of the great feast.²⁵⁶ The parable of the messianic banquet is metaphorical. Jesus (the servant) announces the readiness of the Kingdom of God (the feast) to the religious leaders of Israel (the invited guests) who reject the summons because of preoccupation with their own affairs. Then

253. Cf. T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, p. 84.

254. Cf. B. T. D. Smith, op. cit., p. 203.

255. So B. T. D. Smith, op. cit., p. 206.

256. See T. W. Manson, op. cit., pp. 84ff.; cf. Harnack, op. cit., p. 120.

Jesus extends an open invitation to the am- ha- aretz (the poor and maimed and blind and lame) who accept. But there is still room at the banquet. Thus the servant is charged to extend an open invitation to the denizens of the "highways and hedges." The obvious implication is that the religious leaders of Israel have only a sentimental interest in the Kingdom. They have no real desire to enter it.²⁵⁷

This indictment of the religious leaders is put more directly in the woes (Lk. 11:42-52). The Pharisees are formalists who neglect the weightier matters of the Torah (verse 42). They are vain (verse 43). The scribes both refuse to enter the Kingdom and prevent others from doing so (verse 52). They have hidden the light of the Torah under the mass of their tradition.²⁵⁸

(c) The whole race.

"This generation is an evil generation; it seeks a sign, but no sign shall be given it except the sign of Jonah ... and behold, something greater than Jonah is here" (Lk. 11:29-32/Mt. 12:39-42).

This passage represents Jesus' reply to the charge that His work has not been divinely authenticated (Lk. 11:16). The force of our Lord's answer is that the evil (Mt. "and adulterous," i.e., unfaithful to God) generation will receive no authentication except His preaching.²⁵⁹ And the people are too insensitive to

257. Cf. W. Manson, Luke, p. 173.

258. Finding "light" to refer to the Torah after Psalm 119:105. Cf. B. T. D. Smith, op. cit., p. 171; Dodd, op. cit., p. 145.

259. Mt. 12:40 would have the sign to be the miracle of the Resurrection; but this verse has the appearance of a de facto creation. For the improbability of this interpretation of the sign of Jonah and the difficulty of an alternative interpretation see W. Manson, Luke, pp. 143f.; cf. T. W. Manson, The Mission and Message of Jesus, pp. 381f.

spiritual evidence to recognize the presence of something greater than the kings and prophets.²⁶⁰

(d) The Pharisaic conviction that zealous devotion to the ceremonial and ritual law of Judaism will bring the Kingdom and will assure one entrance into the malkuth. Jesus saw dawning in His ministry a new era transcending the Law and the prophets (Lk. 7:28). The Kingdom of God has broken into time (Lk. 11:20, 10:9, 16:16). Membership in the Jewish nation does not assure one that he will enter the Kingdom (Lk. 14:15-24). Conversely the absence of Jewish nationality does not prevent a man from entering into the Kingdom (Lk. 13:28-30). Meticulous performance of hallowed customs has no magical significance and failure to perform them does not necessarily prejudice ^{one} (Lk. 11:39-41). Religious institutions are themselves temporary; the Temple will fall.²⁶¹

The implication of these sayings would seem to corroborate the inference from Marcan passages, namely, that Jesus did not consider the ceremonial and ritual code of Judaism as unworthy in itself but that He judged it to be a means -- and a temporary one at that -- to fellowship with God.

(3) Jesus held out "promise to the Gentiles." Several Q passages show the sympathy of our Lord for the Gentiles.

(a) In the woes pronounced on Galilean towns (Lk. 10:13-15),²⁶² our Lord opined that the Gentile world would have responded to His

260. The omission of verse 32 in MS. D is probably due to its absence from Matthew.

261. Implied at Lk. 14:34f.

262. The authenticity of this passage has been questioned by some critics. But the disappointment of Jesus in the response which He received in Galilee is undeniable. Further, verse 14 is written from the perspective of a native of Palestine.

ministry (verse 13), and He promised that judgment would be less severe on the Gentiles (verse 14).

(b) In refusing to give a sign (Lk. 11:29ff./Mt. 12:39ff.), Jesus imputed righteousness to Gentiles. They have shown a capacity for enthusiasm about Israel's wisdom (verse 31) and for responding to Israel's prophetic insight (verse 32).²⁶³ They will assess His generation at judgment.²⁶⁴

(c) In the disappointment of Jews in being excluded from the Messianic Banquet (Lk. 13:28-30),²⁶⁵ Jesus affirmed that Jews who have excluded themselves will in pain and humiliation²⁶⁶ see Gentiles²⁶⁷ take places alongside the sons of Abraham in the Kingdom of God.

(d) The parable of the mustard seed (Lk. 13:18-19), which has already been discussed, also portrays the Gentiles in the malkuth.

(e) Sympathy for the Gentiles may be present also at Lk. 14:23. The evangelist obviously understood the denizens of the "highways and hedges" to be Gentiles: he contrasted the afflicted within the city with the denizens out in the "highways and

hedges," and he

263. Its omission by MS. D is easily explained by a homoioteleuton.

264. The idea of the righteous as assessors with God at Judgment was familiar to Jewish thought. For another expression of it, see Mt. 19:28.

265. Verse 30 which is applied differently at Mk. 10:31 (Mt. 19:30) and Mt. 20:16 was probably placed in its present context by the evangelist. So applied it means that Gentiles will take precedence over Jews in the Kingdom of God. This interpretation of our Lord's words at verses 28f. is too sweeping.

266. "Weeping and gnashing of teeth" were symbols found in apocalyptic literature to express the misery of those excluded from the Kingdom.

267. "Men from the east and west..." is a phrase used by Deutero-Isaiah to indicate Gentiles. See chapters 45 and 49.

hedges," and he left the commission to bring them into the feast unfulfilled as the parable closes. The question before us is, Does the evangelist's inference correctly reflect the mind of Jesus? In answering this question we must decide whether or not the parable is altogether an allegorization of the ministry of our Lord. If so, the "poor and maimed and blind and lame" (verse 22) would refer to the humble and earnest people who heard Jesus gladly and the denizens of ^{the} "highways and hedges" (verse 23) would refer to the "publicans and sinners" (Lk. 5:30-32).²⁶⁸ But if we allow for a predictive element, the denizens of the "highways and hedges" would naturally be Gentiles. Since the predictive element is present in the parables of Jesus (e.g., Mk. 12:1ff.) and sympathy for Gentiles is obvious in other sayings of Jesus, the possibility of a reference to Gentiles here can not be overlooked.

The Q passages which relate Jesus' sympathy for the Gentiles clearly indicate that (i) our Lord recognized that Gentiles had capacity for righteous living (see, e.g., Lk. 10:13; 11:29ff.) and (ii) He perceived that they would be present in the malkuth (see, e.g., Lk. 13:18f.; 13:28ff.). Further, Lk. 11:29ff. implies that Jesus appreciated the faith of Gentiles in the presence and power of God. His appreciation of Gentile faith is sharply delineated at Lk. 7:9 where He highly commended the faith of the centurion, "Not even in Israel have I found such faith." Our Lord's response to the Gentile's faith implies that He considered entrance into the blessings of the Kingdom to be contingent

268. Cf. W. Manson, Luke, p. 174.

solely upon faith. (Compare the implication of His ministry to
the am- ha- aretz.)

CHAPTER VI. JUDAISM AND THE GENTILES IN THE MINISTRY OF JESUS:
III. THE L SOURCE

Material which is peculiar to the Gospel according to St. Luke is generally referred to as L by scholars in the English-speaking world.

L is a selection of interesting and memorable stories about Jesus and striking parables from His teaching. The most striking feature of this source is ~~its~~ almost exclusive interest in the am- ha- aretz. The source might be termed a commentary on Mk. 2:17. Jesus is portrayed as the fulfillment of the prophecy of Is. 61:1f., 58:6.¹

L was probably gathered from oral tradition by Luke at Caesarea during Paul's imprisonment there, A. D. 56-58.² Non-polemical, L is second in value only to Mark and Q.

A. JESUS' ATTITUDE TOWARD JUDAISM

L material gives some indication of Jesus' (a) regard for the Torah and (b) attitude toward the ceremonial code of Judaism.

First, there is His use of the Torah. Reference has been made in previous chapters to the fact that the mind of Jesus was saturated with the Hebrew Scriptures. Our present source has at least ten references by our Lord to Old Testament passages.³ Some indication of the nature of Jesus' appeal to the Torah can be discerned by examining His use of the scribal formula. L records three passages in which our Lord said, "Gegraptai."

1. Cf. T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, pp. 43f.

2. Cf. T. W. Manson, The Life of Jesus: A Survey of Available Materials: The Fourth Gospel (Reprint from Ryl. Bul., XXX, no. 2, 1947), p. 20.

3. T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, p. 48, fn. 1.

One passage quotes the Torah:

"For I tell you that this scripture must be fulfilled in Me,
And he was reckoned with transgressors; for what **γέγραπται**
about Me has its fulfillment" (22:37, quoting Is. 53:12).

Two passages cite Scripture:

"Behold, we are going up to Jerusalem, and everything that
γέγραπται of the Son of Man by the prophets will be ac-
complished" (18:31).⁴

"For these are days of vengeance to fulfill all that
γέγραπται " (21:22, probably referring to Hosea 9:7).

A fourth passage is significant at this point. The scribal formu-
la is not used here by Jesus. But its context and content indi-
cate that it is the type of Scripture to which Jesus would have
appealed.⁵

"And there was given to Him the book of the prophet Isaiah. He
opened the book, and found the place where it was written,
The spirit of the Lord is upon me,
because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor.
He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives
and recovering of sight to the blind,
to set at liberty those who are oppressed,
to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord"
(4:17-19, quoting from Is. 61:1-2a, 58:6).

The same conclusions are reached from study of these passages as
were reached from the investigation of Jesus' use of gegraptai as
recorded in Mark and Q. Jesus' appeal to the Torah was not to an
arbitrary authority to whose dictates He must conform. Rather He
found the Torah as prophetic of the goal and the circumstances of
His ministry. He came to fulfill Scripture. See 16:31, which im-
plies that the witness of the Law and the prophets is sufficient.

4. The section 18:31-34 corresponds to Mk. 12:32-34, but the wording suggests
the influence of another tradition. At verse 31 "everything ... accomplished,"
which is not even hinted at in Mark, is added. Further, the Greek is rather
loose, and **Ἱερουσαλήμ** replaces **Ἱεροσόλυμα** (Mark). The only contact
with Matthew is **εἶπεν**. These facts seem to point to L as Luke's source. See,
further, Easton, op. cit., p. 275.

5. See. Lk. 7:22/Mt. 11:4 (Q).

It has been noted in examining both the Marcan and the Q materials that Jesus interpreted the commandments of the Torah and offered His interpretations as authoritative declarations of the will of God. L records one passage which illustrates this fact. 10:29-37 is manifestly Jesus' interpretation of Lev. 19:18. The introduction to the parable⁶ is a lawyer's inquiry about inheriting eternal life. In reply Jesus directed him to the Torah. And the lawyer replied by combining love for God (Deut. 6:15) and love for neighbor (Lev. 19:18). Jesus strongly assented. But the lawyer objected, "Who is my neighbor?" Whereupon Jesus told the story of a man who while traveling from Jerusalem to Jericho was robbed and beaten. Three men saw him in his distress. Two, a priest and a Levite, did nothing to relieve his suffering. The third, A Samaritan, bound up his wounds and carried him to an inn where he could convalesce. Before continuing on his journey the Samaritan made arrangements to pay for the wounded man's care. When the lawyer affirmed in answer to Jesus' apposite question that the third man was neighbor to the unfortunate man, our Lord said, "Go and do likewise."

Jesus said in effect that the question is unanswerable. Love does not begin by defining its objects; it finds them. It creates neighborliness.⁷ "Who needs me is my neighbor. Whom at a given

6. The present setting of the parable is probably secondary. The parable itself belongs to L. But it does not necessarily follow therefrom that the connection between the introduction and parable is artificial (contra Creed, op. cit., p. 151, who strongly urged that the parable is not strictly an answer to the scribe's question) Abrahams has pointed out that the parable, if not originally a midrashic illustration of Lev. 19:18, is indubitably effective for that purpose (op. cit., 2nd series, p. 34).

7. Cf. T. W. Manson, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 553.

time and place I can help with active love, he is my neighbor and I am his."⁸

It is apparent here (as it was in the Marcan and Q records) that Jesus' approach to the Torah was creative and dynamic and that He found within it creative principles and not restricting laws (as did the scribes).

Second, there is Jesus' attitude toward the Jewish ceremonial and ritual law. L records passages which depict Jesus' attitude toward ritual purity and Sabbath observance.

There are Jesus' actions which relate to the concept of ritual cleanness. 17:11-19 relates Jesus advising men to act in conformity with the requirements of ritual purity.⁹ En route to Jerusalem Jesus traveled along the border of (Σὶν μέσῳ) Samaria and Galilee. Upon entering a village our Lord was entreated by ten lepers who kept their distance (such is prescribed at Lev. 13:46). Having observed them, Jesus said, "Go and show yourselves to the priests." As they were departing, they were healed. Whereupon one of them, a Samaritan, having realized that he was healed, returned to our Lord praising God and expressed his gratitude. Then Jesus questioned the gratitude of the nine and sent the Samaritan on his way telling him that his faith had made him well. There are two items in this story to claim our attention at this point. (a) Jesus in this mighty work incurred no ritual defilement as He apparently did in the action reported at Mk. 1:40-45. (b) In ac-

8. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels, vol.2, pp. 936f.

9. That this incident is considered a variant of Mk. 1:40-45 by many scholars need not detain us. See below, p. 156. The style and language of the story is characteristic of L. See Easton, op. cit., p. 261.

cordance with the requirement of the holiness code, "This shall be the law of the leper in the day of his cleansing: He shall be brought to the priest,"¹⁰ Jesus sent the lepers to be certified as clean; the Jews to the Temple in Jerusalem, the Samaritan presumably to his own sanctuary on Mount Gerizim. This is, however, no evidence that our Lord sanctioned the concept of ritual cleanness. In correctly appraising this action of Jesus it is necessary to note that He was acting in accord with the interest of the lepers. Without the certification of cleanness each would remain persona non grata in society. Jesus' personal regard for the concept of ritual purity can be best evaluated in light of His reputation as a friend of "publicans and sinners."

L records two pertinent references to this friendship. On one occasion the Pharisees and scribes charge:

"This man receives sinners and eats with them" (15:2).

On another occasion when Jesus invited Himself to the home of the publican Zacchaeus, those who witnessed it charged:

"He has gone in to be the guest of a man who is a sinner" (19:7).

The orthodox Jewish attitude toward such practice is expressed clearly: "The disciple of the learned... must not sit at table in the company of the am- ha- aretz."¹¹ Such company might serve food which had not been properly tithed. But Jesus sought out such people, and probably incurred ritual impurity Himself by eating food which had not been properly tithed. Our Lord refused to recognize the so-called "hedge" with which orthodox Judaism had

10. Lev. 14:2. For the sacrificial rites which must precede the certification of cleanness, see verses 3ff.

11. Berakot 43, quoted by Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 498.

surrounded itself. As Prof. W. Manson has observed, "Over against the Pharisaic idea of salvation by segregation he sets up the new principle of salvation by association."¹² Cf. Mk. 2:17b.

There are Jesus' actions which relate to the observance of the Sabbath. L has two passages which record Jesus' actions on the Sabbath. (a) Our first passage, 13:10-17,¹³ narrates the healing of a woman in a synagogue on the Sabbath. Jesus was teaching in the synagogue when He noticed a woman who was stooped. He immediately spoke to her and touched her, making her straight. Thereupon the woman praised God. But the ruler of the synagogue was indignant, believing that our Lord had desecrated the Sabbath by this healing. Jesus replied that the relief of human need was no profanation of the Sabbath. Two points in this incident give us pause. (i) The Pharisaic view of our Lord's actions, "There are six days on which work ought to be done; come on those days and be healed, and not on the Sabbath day" (verse 14). Jesus' act in healing the woman was labor, not mercy. This woman had been in her condition for years. Thus her state could not be considered acute or critical. Healing a person in her condition was labor that could very well wait until the Sabbath was over.¹⁴ (ii) Our Lord's view of His own action. He discovered an analogy between His loosing the woman from her infirmity and the Jewish custom of

12. Luke, p. 55.

13. The authenticity of this passage has been questioned by Loisy, who regards it as allegory (op. cit., vol. 2, p. 117). Yet, there is no indication that Luke did not regard the incident as plain history. "Not a word or phrase suggests the symbolism which Loisy wishes to find" (Creed, op. cit., p. 182).

14. See Tanhuma B 20 (38b), quoted by Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 624, which permits life-preserving acts but not acts of labor simply because they are good acts.

loosing cattle from the stall on the Sabbath so that they might drink. Jewish commentators¹⁵ who find fault with Jesus' logic fail to grasp His conception of the woman's infirmity. She was bound by Satan! The force of Jesus' reply is that it is more essential to free a human being from the dominion of Satan than it is to assuage the thirst of a beast. The liberating work of the Kingdom of God takes precedence over the Sabbath laws.¹⁶

(b) Our second passage, 14:1-6, relates Jesus' healing of a man who had dropsy in the home of the Pharisaic leader of a synagogue.¹⁷ Our Lord was in the home to dine with the Pharisee and Pharisaic friends of the host when a man approached Him. The Pharisees watched to see what He would do. Jesus first challenged them as to whether healing on the Sabbath was profane. Then when they were non-committal, He turned and healed the man (*ἐπιλαμβάνειν αὐτόν*). After dismissing him (*ἐπέλυτον*), Jesus justified His act by the Jewish policy of rescuing animals from distress on the Sabbath. Jesus' approach to this conflict is interesting. First, He raised the question of the legality of Sabbath healing (verse 3) without raising the moral question involved. Contrast His procedure on another occasion, as reported by Mark (3:4). But after the healing, Jesus defended His action by an a fortiori argument from a beast to a man.¹⁸ That the legality of giving

15. E.g., Montefiore, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 966.

16. Cf. T. W. Manson, Judaism and Christianity, vol. 3, pp. 130f.

17. There is little reason to doubt the authenticity of this incident. Healing was an important part of Christ's work, and the legality of Sabbath cures was an important matter of principle to Him. It is therefore obviously impossible that His controversy with the Pharisees on this matter was limited to a single occasion or two. This incident can hardly be considered a Lucan creation. The style is not Lucan, and the whole passage has a Semitic construction. See Easton, op. cit., p. 225.

18. See p. 150 (fn. 18).

succor to an animal in distress was disputed in Rabbinic circles¹⁹ is not decisive. "Jesus makes his argument turn not on a legal scruple... but on the dictates of humane feeling."²⁰ It is inherently right to do good.²¹

A conclusion not unlike those reached in the study of the Marcan and Q materials may be drawn from these L passages. Our Lord affirmed that set behavior patterns have no soteriological significance. The Kingdom is already present, its claims overriding the demands of pure conduct and Sabbath observance.

B. THE EXPRESSED MISSION OF JESUS AND HIS DISCIPLES

It is essential to note once more that the mission of Jesus can be apprehended only by recognizing His unique consciousness.

L reports two passages which depict our Lord as being acutely aware of being caught up in the Divine Presence and of being indeed the supreme expression of the Divine Presence:

- (1) "Being asked by the Pharisees when the Kingdom of God was coming, He answered them, The Kingdom of God is not coming with signs to be observed; nor will they say, 'Lo, here it is!' or 'There!' for behold, the Kingdom of God is in the midst of you" (17:20f.).

The Pharisaic demand was a taunt. "When is the malkuth of God, about which you have spoken so often, appearing?" Jesus replied:

18. There is a textual difficulty here. The MSS. evidence for reading "a son or an ox" instead of "an ox or an ass" is considerable and has been adopted by Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort. Neither reading has any intrinsic difficulty. Several considerations favor the reading "an ass or an ox." (i) O. T. phraseology which greatly colored the speech of Jesus coupled the ass and the ox together. (ii) The analogy of Lk. 13:15. (iii) The general sense of the argument. See T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 569.

19. Shabbath 128b (quoted by Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 629) regards the legality of such relief as undisputed. But it is expressly denied at Zad. Frag. 13:23 (Charles' edition).

20. W. Manson, Luke, p. 171.

21. See fn. 47, p. 91, above.

You look in every direction except the right one; you look for external signs by which you can chart its arrival. But no such evidence will ever be given you. The malkuth is already present. That is to say, Jesus and His disciples constitute the sole and sufficient sign of the Kingdom.²²

- (ii) "He opened the book, and found the place where it was written, The spirit of the Lord is upon me,... And He closed the book,... And He began to say to them, Today this scripture is fulfilled in your hearing" (4:17-21).

Although this quotation served as a Jewish-Christian proof-text, Jesus most likely applied it to Himself.²³ Compare Lk. 7:22 (Q). It could very well be, as John Wick Bowman has suggested, Jesus' "interpretation of what the Baptism experience meant to him."²⁴ This passage attests our Lord's consciousness of being (a) imbued with the power of God and (b) responsible for bringing to pass the redemption of the people.²⁵

L has no explicit statement of Jesus' consciousness of Sonship to God. But such consciousness would seem to be implicit in the infrequent references by Jesus to God as Father.²⁶ References by Jesus to God as Father are found at 22:49, 22:29, 23:34, 23:46. The parable at 15:11-32 implies the Fatherhood of God.

22. Cf. W. Manson, Luke, pp. 196f. Two other interpretations have been given to verse 21b. a) It is an assertion of the inward and spiritual character of the Kingdom. The difficulty with this interpretation is that it would presume that our Lord considered the Pharisees to be reborn! B) It is held by the school of Schweitzer (e.g., K. L. Schmidt in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, vol. 1, p. 587) that Jesus was asserting that the malkuth which was yet future, would come without warning. But this interpretation forces an unnatural sense on the words (see Otto, op. cit., pp. 131ff.).

23. Cf. J. Weiss, Schriften, vol. 1, pp. 406f.; Otto, op. cit., p. 344; and see further, p. 157, fn. 45.

24. The Intention of Jesus, p. 147

25. In this sense of responsibility underlies the act of forgiveness of sins at 7:48.

26. See pp. 95f., 129f., above.

It has been noted in the study of the Marcan and Q materials that Jesus' unique consciousness led Him to seek to create a people of God. L reports the same five phases of activity in which our Lord engaged to the end that people might enter into the fellowship of God.

(1) Jesus proclaimed the presence of the Malkuth. "The Kingdom of God is in the midst of you." "He has anointed Me to preach good news" (4:18b). That this proclamation was an invitation to repent and enter the community of God's spirit is graphically emphasized at 13:15 and in the parables at 15:8-24.

(2) Our Lord performed *Συμμερίαις*. This activity is reflected at 4:18.²⁷ "He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovering of sight to the blind,..." The L passage, however, which most explicitly states the function of the miracle is 17:11-19. When the Samaritan returned to express appreciation for his cleansing, Jesus asked, "Was no one found to return to give praise to God except this foreigner?" This saying is difficult for the expositor. But it certainly means that our Lord expected one who received benefit from a mighty work to receive it as an expression of Divine love and thus to enter more fully into the malkuth.²⁸

(3) Jesus consorted with publicans and sinners. L gives the greatest witness to our Lord's association with and sympathy for the am- ha- aretz. So abundant is the evidence and so intense the sympathy expressed for the disreputable that T. W. Manson has recently referred to part of L (chapters 15:19) as being in an un-

27. Miracle is reported at 7:11-17.

28. See Lk. 11:20/Mt. 12:28 (Q).

usual sense "The Gospel of the Outcasts."²⁹ L alone tells the tender scene with the sinful woman in the home of Simon (7:36-50) and records the visit in the home of Zacchaeus (19:10). L gives the most emphatic expression of God's love for the unlovable. It reports the outreaching love of the Father for the prodigal son (15:11-24). And it is here that the explanation of Jesus' association with sinners is found. His fellowship with them was neither idle nor ill-conceived.³⁰ He dined with them and conversed with them that they ^{might} experience the redeeming love of God.³¹ "The Son of Man came to seek and save the lost" (19:10). To the penitent woman He said, "Your sins are forgiven" (7:48). To penitent Zacchaeus He promised, "Today salvation has come to this house" (19:9).

(4) Jesus called disciples. L reflects the same twofold purpose in calling associates. (a) The disciples through association with Him enter into close fellowship with God. They surrender all before the claim of the malkuth (14:28-33). They receive divine power to cast out demons. (b) Their experience within God's grace makes them "fishers of men" (5:10), who topple Satan from heaven (10:17-22). They enter into the people of God that they may assist Jesus in creating a people of God.

(5) Jesus sacrificed His life. The evidence in this source is not as full as that of Mark. Nonetheless, it is significant. L has two distinct references to Jesus' consciousness of impending

29. The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 574.

30. Note His advice to a host at 14:12-14.

31. The difference between Jesus' attitude toward the am- ha- aretz and that of the strictest Pharisaism is illustrated in an old Rabbinic rule from Mekhilta on Ex. 18:1: "Let not a man associate with the wicked, not even to bring him nigh to the Law" (quoted by Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 208).

death.

- (a) "At that very same hour some Pharisees came, and said to Him, Get away from here, for Herod wants to kill you. And He said to them, Go and tell that fox, Behold, I cast out demons and perform cures today and tomorrow, and the third day I finish my course. I must go on my way today and tomorrow and the day following; for it cannot be that a prophet should perish away from Jerusalem" (13:31-33).

This event has the strongest historical probability.³² Wellhausen urged that *καὶ τρίπῃ τελειοῦμαι* (verse 32) and *σήμερον καὶ αὔριον καὶ* (verse 33) should be omitted.³³ This conjecture gives a smoother text, but is not necessary. This incident probably belongs to an earlier point in the ministry of Jesus, namely the period reported at Mk. 6:14-16.³⁴ Two factors stand out in this passage. i) Jesus precognized His death. ii) His death completed or perfected (*τελειοῦμαι*) His work. Jesus wilfully chose the cross, He did not die simply as a martyr. The second L passage reveals the purpose of His death.

- (b) "And He took a cup, and when He had given thanks He said, Take this and divide it among yourselves; for I tell you that from now on I shall not drink of the fruit of the vine until the Kingdom of God comes. And He took bread and when He had given thanks, He broke it and gave it to them saying, This is my body" (22:17-19a).

The compass of this paper does not permit a discussion of the vexed problem of the variant traditions of this event. Concerning the authenticity of this account it is sufficient to note Otto's judgment that this passage records "an event which had no organic connection with the life of the Church but only with that of Christ himself."³⁵ Otto, who considers the L form to be original, rejects

32. See Easton, op. cit., p. 222.

33. Op. cit., ad. loc.

34. Cf. W. Manson, Luke, p. 168; Creed, op. cit., p. 186.

35. The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, p. 268.

verses 19a-20 and 28 and considers verses 21-27 to be out of context and urges that verses 29-30 were once connected immediately with the saying, "This is my body."³⁶ The breaking and partaking of the bread then is the means of establishing a covenant (*συντίθεμαι ὑμῖν*) in which the partakers receive the Kingdom. The symbol of the bread "stands for the vicarious sacrifice of the Son of Man as something not only offered to God on behalf of men but -- in accordance with the true meaning of sacrifice at last perceived -- offered in their stead. The Son of Man came not only to give his life a ransom for men, but to make them sharers of his sacrifice, and so to claim, commit, and consecrate them for the Kingdom of Heaven."³⁷

Harnack's question must again be considered. The answer that L gives is essentially the same as that found in Mark and Q.

(1) Jesus concentrated His ministry upon Israel. The mission journeys which He made were within the land where the Jews lived. The sinners whom He sought out were the disenfranchised of Israel, such as Zacchaeus. L reports no journey of Jesus outside of Palestine. It refers to a journey through Samaria (9:51-56). But the statement is that Jesus was merely passing through (*διὰ μέσον*) en route to Jerusalem. Further, L records not even a chance encounter with a Gentile.³⁸

(2) Yet, our Lord's ministry to ^{the} Jews did not preclude His ministering to the non-Jew. L relates that He healed a Samaritan

36. Op. cit., pp. 269ff.

37. W. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p. 146.

38. But Dodd thinks that possibly the attack which provides the sitz im leben for the parables in chapter 15 was directed not only against Jesus' association with the am- ha- aretz but also against a too free intercourse with Gentiles (op. cit., p. 120).

leper (17:11-19). There is a marked tendency among scholars to question the historicity of this incident. The account shows obvious signs of embellishment. Comparison with Mk. 1:40-45 indicates that the Marcan story has a more natural character. It would seem that the miraculous quality has been heightened at 17:11-19 where the cure is performed from a distance.³⁹ Further, it seems improbable (though not impossible) that ten lepers could be found at one time ^{with} sufficient faith to receive a cure. If it be assumed that ten were healed, Jesus' concern over the failure of the nine to "give praise to God" before Him is not easily explained. It would seem probable that 17:11-19 is a variant of a more original account. But it is not altogether certain that this original account is Mk. 1:40-45. In fact there are good reasons to think otherwise. i) It is not impossible that Jesus healed a leper on more than one occasion. ii) The tradition that our Lord had associations with Samaritans is considerable. L reports in addition to the incident considered here a journey through Samaria (9:51-56). And the parable of the Good Samaritan is more readily explained if Jesus had associated with Samaritans.⁴⁰ Moreover, there is the independent Johannine tradition that Jesus had not only passed through Samaria but also conducted a ministry there (4:3ff.). There is except to minds which impute to our Lord extreme Jewish racial bigotry nothing incredible about His association with the Samaritans.⁴¹ And He was apparently free of such prejudice.⁴² There is no sufficient reason to doubt that the inci-

39. But Otto considers this a genuine part of tradition.

40. Cf. H. Balmforth, St. Luke, p. 205.

41. See Otto, op. cit., p. 18.

42. See pp. 104f., above.

dent reported at 17:11-19 with some embellishments was one in which Jesus healed a Samaritan.⁴³ And there is no reason to suppose that He did so with reluctance.⁴⁴

The basis for comprehending the significance of this evidence is found in the Sermon at Nazareth (4:16-30). Criticism has been leveled at the authenticity of this event. But it must be admitted that this L passage reflects the mind of Jesus at an advanced stage in His ministry.⁴⁵

"Today this scripture is fulfilled in your hearing."
Jesus willed to fulfill the religious tradition of Israel. It is not strange that He purposely went only to the Jews.

"Elijah was sent ... only to Zarephath, in the land of Sidon, to a woman who was a widow. And there were many lepers in Israel in the time of the prophet Elisha; and none of them was cleansed, but only Naaman the Syrian."

43. Cf. W. Manson, Luke, p. 168.

44. Cf. Otto, op. cit., p. 18.

45. The setting of this event at the beginning of our Lord's Galilean ministry is indefensible. It is obvious that the evangelist anticipated a later occasion. The reasons are twofold. i) Mark places Jesus' earliest activities in Capernaum (1:21) and records His first visit to Nazareth at a comparatively advanced stage of the Galilean ministry (6:1). Luke omits Mk. 6:1ff. ii) The Nazarenes in this very passage allude to a previous work of Jesus at Capernaum (Lk. 4:23). See W. Manson, op. cit., pp. 40f. Most critics agree that our passage and Mk. 6:1-6 refer to the same event. The essential features of Mk. 6:1ff. are present. But criticism, noting that the Marcan story is expanded in two directions -- 1) the sermon's announcement of the program of the Gospel and 2) the appeal to the precedents of Elijah and Elisha -- has labeled the Lucan passage as a "representative and symbolic scene" which foreshadows the rejection of the Gospel by the Jews and the subsequent universal mission of the Church. See Creed, op. cit., pp. 65f. The force of this argument must be granted. The Lucan passage no doubt well served this very purpose. But it is not impossible that this report is based on authentic oracles of our Lord. His whole ministry was marked with a tremendous sense of personal responsibility for bringing to pass the redemption which He preached. Moreover, the indications are strong that Jesus, like the greatest prophets after 586 B. C., saw God's interest reaching beyond the limitations of Jewish nationality. Cf. W. Manson, op. cit., pp. 42f.

The universal mission marked the thought and sometimes the acts of the prophets. Jesus projected His ministry with the salvation of more than Israel in mind.

A further indication of the universal purpose of His ministry is found in the evidence that Jesus in performing His Messianic office was influenced by the ideals of the Son of Man⁴⁶ and the Suffering Servant,⁴⁷ both of whom were to rule over and be a light to the Gentiles.⁴⁸

Although the L evidence is not as strong as that of Mark or Q, it implies that Jesus conceived His mission as being in a real sense for all people. The healing of the Samaritan leper reflects this wider interest.

It remains to note the scope of the mission of the disciples. The Twelve⁴⁹ have expanded to seventy,⁵⁰ signifying the universality of the Gospel.⁵¹ But the mission of the seventy apparently was to Israel only. They were sent "on ahead of Him, two by two, into every town and place where He was about to come" (10:1).

C. THE JUDGMENT OF JESUS ON JUDAISM AND THE GENTILES

The non-polemical character of L and its lack of interest in the Gentiles preclude the possibility that there would be hardly any evidence that Jesus considered the question, "On what terms shall the Gentiles be brought into the orbit of the covenant privi-

46. The phrase "Son of Man" occurs five times in L. At 19:10 and 22:48 it could only refer to Jesus.

47. It is sufficient here to note the meaning of the distribution of the bread as a "ransom for many" (22:19). See Otto, *op. cit.*, p. 272.

48. See above, p. 109.

49. The L account is most likely a variant of the Marcan and Q accounts. It is apparently a doublet.

50. There is strong ms. evidence for the reading "seventy-two."

51. According to Gen. 10, there were seventy nations in the world.

leges?" Yet, it may be expected that if the Church's subsequent answer has any basis in the ministry of Jesus some indications of how our Lord answered the query can be found in L. There are two facts to consider.

(1) L contains traces of Jesus' indictment of contemporary Judaism. (a) Jesus indicted Pharisaism. In the parable of the prodigal son Pharisees are rebuked for their jealousy of Divine love for and generosity toward the sinner, although the charge is softened by the assurance, "Son, you are always with me, and all that is mine is yours" (15:31). But elsewhere indictment of the Pharisees is more poignant. Pharisees are the victims of the temptations which confront all who equate God's will with set behavior patterns: they seek the praise of men rather than that of God (16:15) and they rely upon their own righteousness (18:11f.). But self-righteousness debars them from real fellowship with God; God is more accessible to the publican because of his consciousness of sin (18:9-14).

(b) Jesus indicted the Holy City (19:41-44; cf. 23:28-32).⁵² Implicit in this charge is an indictment against the Temple authorities. Inured to "the things that make for peace" they rejected our Lord and His message. Because of this lack of sensitivity to righteousness the Holy City was to be ravaged and the Temple destroyed.

On the basis of L itself nothing more can be said about our Lord's judgment upon Judaism. Nowhere is the ceremonial and ritual code said to be unworthy. In light of the Marcan and Q evidence it might be inferred that the ritual system is only a means --

52. Concerning the authenticity of 19:41-44, see T. W. Manson, The Mission and Message of Jesus, pp. 611f.

and a temporary one at that -- to fellowship with God.

(2) There are indications that Jesus considered faith as the sole and sufficient requisite for one's receiving the blessings of the malkuth. He called the am- ha- aretz to accept τὸ εὐαγγέλιον God's steadfast and redeeming love. L contains no evidence that He urged them to Pharisaic devotion to the ceremonial and ritual code. Our Lord's ministry to the publicans and sinners implies that a loving response to God's mercy is the only requirement for entrance into the Kingdom. Two L passages which refer to non-Jews have the same implication. (i) The sole reference to Gentiles, 4:16-30, implies that Gentiles would be responsive to the proclamation to the Gospel. If as this writer thinks the Sermon is based on actual words of Jesus,⁵³ the original oracle could not have indicated less than Jesus' conviction that the providence of God protects the Gentiles and that they would eventually enter into His Kingdom. (ii) Our Lord's final word to the Samaritan leper, "Rise and go your way; your faith has made you well" (17:19),⁵⁴ explicitly delineates faith as the requisite to receiving the blessings of the malkuth.

53. See, above, fn. 45, p. 157.

54. This statement is characteristic of Jesus' perception of the necessary condition for His performing a miracle. See, above, pp. 96f.

101

CHAPTER VII. JUDAISM AND THE GENTILES IN THE MINISTRY OF JESUS:
IV. THE M SOURCE

Material peculiar to the Gospel according to St. Matthew is generally referred to as M among scholars in the English-speaking world. The scope of this source has been recently subjected to careful scrutiny by Kilpatrick, who concluded that M contained no narrative, but only **מִשְׁכָּל יְהוּדָה**.¹

M has several unique characteristics. Its atmosphere is conspicuously Jewish. Jesus is depicted as a Rabbi, however unorthodox. His teaching is combined with the Torah to effect a new Law. Obedience to the Torah and to the traditions of the scribes is mandatory. Nonetheless, there is a strong anti-Pharisaic polemic. Finally, M is distinctly anti-Gentile.²

The source obviously is the product of the Judaizing party which centered in Jerusalem.³ It was in circulation by A. D. 70. M is an important source for the teaching of our Lord, but must be used with extreme care because of its strong anti-Pauline bias.

A. JESUS' ATTITUDE TOWARD JUDAISM

Again it will be convenient to group the relevant material according to Jesus' approach to the Torah and His attitude toward the ceremonial and ritual law of Judaism.

First, there is Jesus' attitude toward the Torah. Reference has already been made several times to Jesus' profound and extensive understanding of the Hebrew Scriptures.⁴ M contains 28 references by our Lord to the Old Testament.⁴

-
1. See The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew.
 2. Cf. T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, pp. 34ff.
 3. Cf. Streeter, op. cit., p. 232.
 4. T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 48, fn. 1.

In M three data indicate the attitude of Jesus to Scripture.

(1) Nowhere in its passages does Jesus use the scribal formula, *γέγραπται*, in appealing to the Torah. The closest approximation to "it is written" is "it is said," *ἐρρέθη* (5:21-48). The use of this phrase, however, is not an appeal to the authority of the Torah; see below, p. 164.

(2) Yet, there are several passages which portray Jesus as affirming the authority of the Law.

(a) "Think not that I came to abolish the Law and the prophets; I came not to abolish them but to fulfill them" (5:17).⁵

There is no good reason for doubting the authenticity of this saying, although Allen considers "and the prophets" to be an editorial insertion.⁶ Several factors, (i) the general use of *πληρῶσαι* at Mt. 3:15, (ii) its antithetical relation to *κατελθεῖν*, and (iii) the relation of the whole verse to verses 18f., suggest that this utterance means: Jesus came not to destroy but to confirm or establish the Law as the final authority.⁷ This interpretation overlooks, however, the relation of this oracle to verses 21-48. As Allen has pointed out, "fulfil" must refer with "abolish" to the teaching for which Jesus came. Thus *πληρῶσαι* means not to "establish" in the sense of giving literal obedience, but to "make full," i.e. "reveal the full depth of meaning."⁸ Our Lord came not to annul the Torah but to give the temporal thing an eternal

5. A distorted reminiscence of this saying is recorded in Bab. Talmud Shabbath 116b, discussed by Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 241f.

6. Op. cit., p. 46.

7. Cf. Branscomb, who cites a parallel saying (Aboth 4:11): "R. Jonathan said, He who fulfils the Torah when he is poor will fulfil it in the end when he is rich. And he who makes void the Torah when he is rich will in the end make it void when he is poor" (Jesus and the Law of Moses, pp. 227f.).

8. Op. cit.

validity by bringing to pass its highest and noblest insights.⁹

His teaching was the fulfillment of the Torah.

- (b) "Whoever relaxes then one of the least of these commandments and teaches men to do so, shall be called least in the Kingdom of heaven; but he who does them and teaches them shall be called great in the Kingdom of heaven" (5:19).

In its present context this saying depicts Jesus "as speaking in the spirit of Alexandrine and Rabbinical Judaism."¹⁰ The Torah is the final authority. The law concerning divorce, the ritual laws which exclude men from religious fellowship, must be literally obeyed and taught. The impossibility that Jesus, who said "But I say to you," commanded His followers to give scribal obedience to the Torah is self-evident. As Erich Klosterman has pointed out, this oracle must be "einem Gegensatz gegen Paulus, oder wenigstens die Ultrapauliner."¹¹

- (c) "The scribes and the Pharisees sit on Moses' seat; so practise and observe whatever they tell you, but not what they do; for they preach, but do not practise" (23:2f.).

This oracle also represents our Lord as affirming that the Torah is the final authority. The oral as well as the written Law must be observed. This saying is manifestly a product of a Jewish-Christian community.¹² It enjoins Christians to keep the same Sabbath rules which Jesus set aside. It ignores the fact that there are weightier matters of the Law. Except for the polemic against scribes and Pharisees, it suggests Aboth 1:1.¹³

(3) The most authentic representation in M of Jesus' attitude toward the Torah is found in the so-called antitheses. **Ἡκούετε**

99. Cf. Robinson, Matthew, p. 35.

10. Allen, op. cit., p. 45.

11. Matthäus (vol 2 of Handbuch zum Neuen Testament), p. 188.

12. See Acts 21:20f.

13. Cf. T. W. Manson, Mission and Message of Jesus, pp. 320f.

ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις... ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν.. Albertz

demonstrates that this formula is an integral part of the saying at 5:21f., 27f., 33f.¹⁴ Concerning the witness of the antitheses it is sufficient here to record the claim of Jesus to place His own interpretation upon the commandments of Scripture and offer those as authoritative declarations of the will of God. Compare the witness of Mark, Q, and L.

Second, in spite of its affinity of spirit to Rabbinic Judaism, M corroborates the witness of Mark, Q, and L that Jesus set aside claims of the ceremonial and ritual law of Judaism. The antitheses depict our Lord as affirming in conscious opposition to legalistic Judaism that God claims the whole will of man and not just prescribed external acts.¹⁵ Further, M records two passages, both relating Sabbath controversies, which show Jesus in conflict with the behavior pattern of the ceremonial law.

(1) 12:5-7 was inserted by "Matthew" into the Marcan account of the controversy provoked by the disciples' plucking and eating grain on the Sabbath. The act of the disciples was a serious matter from the view-point of strict Judaism. Ex. 31:14-15 sanctioned extirpation of those who profaned the Sabbath by working. Our Lord defended the behavior of His disciples first by citing David's eating the shewbread. To this "Matthew" added the present passage which originally had a different setting.¹⁶ The argument in these

14. Die Synoptischen Streitgespräche, pp. 146f. It is possible that the antitheses at verse 39f. and 43f. also belonged to early tradition. But since the positive teaching is found in Q, doubt remains. The formula at verse 31 is definitely editorial.

15. Cf. Bultmann, Das Urchristentum, p. 78.

16. The term "guiltless" in verse 7 seems to indicate another context. Cf. T. W. Manson, op. cit., pp. 479f.

verses is in such form as to meet and convince the strict upholder of the Law and tradition on his own ground. "The priests in the Temple profane the Sabbath and are guiltless." That is to say, the carrying out of Temple ritual requires work to be done; and it is done, on the Sabbath, with impunity. This work was permitted by the principles laid down by the scribes that possible commandments, for whose performance a definite time is prescribed, override the Sabbath laws in case of a conflict.¹⁷ Jesus took the principles as a common ground and applied another Rabbinic principle called Qal wa-homer, concluding: "If it is permissible to break the Sabbath law for the sake of something greater than the Temple and its ritual?" It is to be noted that it is a greater thing (μεῖζον) than the Temple which is present. Jesus did not claim arbitrary authority. He acted in the name and in the interest of something greater than the Law and the Temple, namely, the Kingdom of God.¹⁸

(2) 12:11-12 (cf. Lk. 14:5 -L)¹⁹ was inserted by "Matthew" into the Marcan account of the controversy over our Lord's healing the man with the withered hand. Several differences are apparent in the two accounts. (a) "Matthew" omitted Jesus' words to the man, "Stand forth" (Mk. 3:30). (b) He has the question of the legality of Sabbath healing differently worded and asked not by our Lord (so Mark) but by the Pharisees. (c) Jesus replied to this question with the M passage:

17. See Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 620f.

18. Cf. T. W. Manson, Judaism and Christianity, vol. 3, pp. 130f.

19. Considered to be Q by Kilpatrick, op. cit., p. 27. But the independence of the Lucan setting and the slight differences in content and style suggest to this writer that they belong to different sources.

"What man of you, if he has one sheep and it falls into a pit on the Sabbath, will not lay hold of it and lift it out? Of how much more value is a man than a sheep! So it is lawful to do good on the Sabbath."

The form of our Lord's question suggests that He was appealing not to rule,²⁰ but to the actual practice of His auditors. His argument proceeded a fortiori: as much should be done for man.

B. THE EXPRESSED MISSION OF JESUS AND HIS DISCIPLES

Even as do Mark, Q, and L, the M source bases the ministry of Jesus upon His unique consciousness. *ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν*.²¹ *τοῦ ἱεροῦ μεῖζόν ἐστιν ὁ θεός*.²² Our Lord was conscious of the Divine Presence being present with Him. But M does not define, as exactly as do Mark and Q, the precise nature of this consciousness. It contains approximately twenty references by Jesus to God as Father.²³ And the parable at 21:28-31 implies the Fatherhood of God. In the light of Marcan and Q evidence one may find Jesus' Sonship implicit in these passages.

M indicates that our Lord sought through four phases of activity to create a people of God. This source has no reference to Jesus' Sacrifice.

(1) Jesus proclaimed the presence of the malkuth. The parable of the wheat and the tares (13:24-30) appears to have been a reply of Jesus to the Jewish objection that the Kingdom could not have come because there are sinners in Israel.²⁴ Our Lord urged that the malkuth is the most valuable possession a man can have

20. Cf. Lk. 14:5 (L).

21. See Otto, op. cit., pp. 162f.

22. That "greater" refers to the Kingdom of God must not obscure the Christological significance of this verse. The presence of the malkuth was intimately related in the consciousness of Jesus to Himself and His ministry.

23. See T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus, pp. 96f.

24. Cf. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom, pp. 183ff.

and that men should enter it at any cost (13:44f.).

(2) Our Lord performed mighty works. M reports no specific *εὐαγγελία*. At 12:11f. it alludes to this phase of Jesus' activity and affirms that He set aside the Sabbath law in order that men might experience the love of God.

(3) Jesus consorted with am- ha- aretz. This association is reflected in several M passages. "Come unto Me, all who labor and are heavy-laden, and I will give you rest" (11:28). "Truly, I say to you, the tax collectors and the harlots go into the Kingdom of God before you" (21:31b).²⁵ The parable of the dragnet (13:47-50) means that the mission of Jesus and His disciples involves "an undiscriminating appeal to men of every class and type" to enter the fellowship of God's spirit.²⁶ The parables at 13:24-30 and 20:1-16 probably had the same original application.²⁷

(4) Jesus called disciples. M also reveals the dual purpose of this association. Our Lord invited them to experience sonship to the Father.²⁸ He sent them out to invite others to enter the mal-kuth (10:5f.).

The M reply to Harnack's question, Among whom did Jesus seek to create a people of God? has a unique feature. This source reports in the clearest terms that our Lord conceived His ministry to be the fulfillment of (*πληρωμα*) Jewish religious tradition²⁹ and that He directed His mission only to Israel. But it goes

25. That this clause appears secondary does not refute its interpretation of the parable (2:28-31a). See Smith, *op. cit.*, 209.

26. Dodd, *op. cit.*, p. 188; cf. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 201. The key to the interpretation of this parable is found at Mk. 1:17.

27. See Dodd, *op. cit.*, pp. 183, 122f.

28. There are in M approximately twenty references by Jesus to God as Father, most of which are addressed to the disciples.

29. 5:17.

beyond the general witness of tradition and affirms in contradiction of Mark, Q, and L that Jesus confined His vision to the Jews.

The dogma is found in the account of the incident involving the heathen woman, 15:21-28; cf. Mk. 7:24-30. There are a number of differences in the Matthean and Marcan narratives. An analysis of both is necessary.

Mark

24. Jesus **ἀπηλθεν** to the region of Tyre and Sidon; He entered a home and hoped to keep His presence there a secret.

25f. However, the woman, a Syrophoenician, begged Him to exorcise a demon from her daughter.

27. Jesus answered, "Let the children first be fed; for it is not fair to take the bread of the children and throw it to the dogs."

28. The woman rejoined, "Even the dogs under the table eat the children's crumbs."

29f. Jesus replied, "For this saying,..."

21. Jesus **ἀπεχώρησεν** to the district of Tyre and Sidon.

22. The woman, a Canaanite from **τῶν ὀρίων**, came out and asked Him, "Have mercy on me, O Lord, Son of David," and informed Him that her daughter **κακῶς διαμονίζεται**.

23. Jesus remained silent. **καὶ προέβουτες** the disciples urged Him **ἀπόλυτον αὐτήν**.

24. Jesus responded, "I was sent only to the lost sheep of Israel."

25. The woman renewed her plea.

26. Jesus answered, "It is not fair to take the bread of the children and throw it to the dogs."

27. The woman rejoined, "Even the dogs eat the crumbs that fall from their master's table."

28. Jesus replied, "Great is your faith,..."

It is possible that "Matthew substituted a second and longer account for the Marcan narrative. But the consensus of critical judgment takes an alternative solution. Most of the differences

can be explained by editorial activity.³⁰ At verse 21, ἀναχωρέω
 "withdraw" is Matthean.³¹ The omission of Mk. 7:24b by "Matthew"
 is quite consistent considering that he has incorporated at 10:5f.
 a saying which restricted the disciples from incursions into the
 Gentile communities on their mission journey. At verse 22, τὰ
 ὄρια is an editorial term;³² and so is δαιμονίζομαι.³³ The
 verse uses material from Mk. 10:48 as well as from Mk. 7:25.³⁴
 Verse 23 can be explained as a free composition of the evangelist
 using the story of Blind Bartimaeus for materials.³⁵ προερχομαι³⁶
 and ἀπολύω³⁷ are Matthean terms. Verse 24 reflects 10:6. The
 differences between verses 25-28 and Mark verses 27-30 can be ac-
 counted for by "Matthew's" desire (a) to explain the ambiguity of
 the "Children" as Mk. 7:27a and (b) to emphasize that it was the
 woman's faith (πίστις) which altered Jesus' policy of working
 only among His own people.³⁸

This analysis indicates that the saying "I was sent only to
 the lost sheep of Israel," is the only part of the pericope which
 must be assigned to M. It seem to be an intrusion in its present
 context designed to show that Jesus accepted the same limitations

30. A third solution has found a recent exponent in Donald F. Robinson, who argues that the Matthean account is older and more original and that Mark has rewritten it for Gentile readers (The Journal of Biblical Literature, vol. 66 (1947), p. 162). This solution seems to be based on the assumption that Jesus must have been a racial bigot. Further, it ignores the evidence of obvious editorial activity in Matthew.

31. Occurs ten times in Matthew, once in Mark, and not at all in Luke.

32. Inserted twice into Marcan contexts at 4:13 and 15:39.

33. Inserted twice into Marcan contexts at 4:24 and 8:28 and once into a Q context at 12:22.

34. Cf. Kilpatrick, op. cit., p. 50.

35. Ibid.

36. Occurs over fifty times in Matthew, six times in Mark, twelve times in Luke.

37. Inserted into Marcan contexts at 14:22f. and 18:8.

38. Cf. Allen, op. cit., p. 169.

for His ministry that He requested the disciples to observe.³⁹ That this saying reflects the actual practice of our Lord cannot be gainsaid: He sought out only the Israelites. Nevertheless, the saying cannot have adequately represented the mind of Jesus. If He uttered it at all, it applied to the circumstances of a moment.⁴⁰

The saying characterizes Jewish-Christianity rather than our Lord. M itself indicates that Jesus was influenced in evolving His Messianic function by the concept of the Son of Man whose dominion was to include "all the nations of the world."⁴¹ Moreover, at least one M parable (13:47-50) indicates that the mission of our Lord involved "an indiscriminating appeal to men of every class and type."⁴² Even M tends to reflect the fact that the mind of Jesus was characteristic of missionary Judaism at its best.

It remains to note the scope of the mission of the disciples. Two M sayings are unique.

"Do not give dogs what is holy;
and do not throw your pearls before swine,
lest they trample them underfoot
and turn to attack you."

As this disjunct saying (7:6) stands, it means: do not give the malkuth⁴³ to the Gentiles;⁴⁴ for they will violate it and do violence to you.⁴⁵ The spirit expressed is characteristic of extreme Jewish bigotry. It would seem to be a "bit of apocalyptic Jewish exclusiveness, adopted by Jewish Christians, and incorporated a-

39. 10:6.

40. Cf. T. W. Manson, The Mission and Message of Jesus, p. 493.

41. Dodd, op. cit., p. 188.

42. Dan. 7:13f.

43. See 13:46 for pearls as a symbol of the Kingdom.

44. The equation of Gentiles with dogs (wild beasts) and swine (unclean) was characteristic of Rabbinic Judaism.

45. Cf. Wellhausen, Das Evangelium Matthaei, p. 31.

mong the sayings of Jesus."⁴⁶

"Go nowhere among the Gentiles,
and enter no town of the Samaritans,
but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel."

This oracle is found in the mission charge (10:5f.). In effect it commands: do not go to the Hellenistic cities of Palestine, the Decapolis, where Greek religion dominates, and do not go to the Samaritans who hold to the religion of Israel with reservations. Go rather to those in Israel who live in anticipation of the mal-kuth. These verses reflect the policy of the Twelve in the first years of the Church. Their only claim to genuineness is as application to the exigencies of a given situation. M indicates that the charge was marked by an apocalyptic haste. But 10:23 is suspect in light of Mk. 13:32. It remains that this utterance can not have been enunciated by Jesus as dogma to cover all the activity of the disciples. These verses contradict the breadth of vision which was so manifestly His, and they would have precluded the great commission feature of the Resurrection Experience.

C. THE JUDGMENT OF JESUS ON JUDAISM AND THE GENTILES

It could hardly be expected that M would contain any sayings that would answer the question, "On what terms shall the Gentiles be admitted into the orbit of the covenant privileges?" The document is so obviously anti-Gentile. Yet, it might be expected that if the teaching of our Lord furnished any basis for the Church's eventual reply to the question some key to the ultimate answer could be discovered even in the Judaistic source.

Several facts need be noted. (1) Although no explicit state-

46. Cf. T. W. Manson, op. cit., p. 466.

ment to the effect is discoverable in M, one passage suggests that Jesus invited loyalty to Himself which is due only to God (25:31-46). The portrait of the Great Assize is suspect. Prof. Dodd concludes that "The judgment scene was probably composed to give a vivid, dramatic setting to" verses 40 and 45.⁴⁷ These two verses, "Truly I say to you, as you did it (not) to one of the least of these my brethren, you did it (not) to Me," presume what is explicitly declared in Mark (8:38) and Q (Lk. 12:8f./Mt. 10:32f.), namely that entrance into the Kingdom is conditioned upon receiving Jesus and His message.

(2) Our Lord judged Judaism. M contains no saying which could be interpreted as an indictment of Jewish forms and rites. To the contrary 23:2f. indicates the strongest appreciation for them. M's record of Jesus' judgment of Judaism is wholly a condemnation of Pharisaism. The indictment is scathing. The Pharisees are portrayed as preaching, but not practising (23:2f.); as being spiritually blind (23:16-22, 24); and as being spiritually decadent (23:37). It must be admitted that this source heightens Jesus' condemnation of the Pharisees. Yet, the fact remains that our Lord indicted Pharisaism. They placed an exclusive stress on external behavior, on conformity to a set conduct pattern (23:26).

Jesus demanded righteousness transcending that of the scribes and Pharisees. Only those whose righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees would enter the Kingdom (5:20). Good behavior is not sufficient in itself; the acts must issue from and be expressions of mercy, purity of heart, and sincere devotion (5:21-

47. Op. cit., p. 85, fn. 1.

24, 27f., 33-37; 6:1-6, 16-18; cf. 5:7-10). Character, not merely good behavior is the sine qua non for entrance into the Kingdom. Zealous loyalty to the Jewish ceremonial and ritual code is not enough.

(3) M contains two indications that Jesus considered faith to be the sole requisite for entrance into the Kingdom. (a) He consorted with the am- ha- aretz. M tends to suggest that Jesus enjoined them to embrace zealously the ceremonial and ritual law of Judaism (23:2f.; cf. 5:19). But this portrait has been seen to be impossible. Jesus called sinners simply to respond to God's love with love. (b) The Great Assize shows τὰ ἔθνη entering into the joys of the malkuth upon the condition that their lives expressed a merciful and pure heart (25:32ff.). The authenticity of these verses is generally disallowed. But it must be urged that Jesus' characteristic picture of the Kingdom had Gentiles present.⁴⁸ It is noteworthy that the condition for Gentile entrance into the malkuth here is identical with our Lord's demand upon the Pharisees (see above) and that it corresponds to the sole requirement upon Gentiles which has been found to be implicit in the Marcan and Q materials.

48. See, for example, Lk. 13:28-30.

CHAPTER VII. EPILOGUE

There remains to be made here only a summary statement. In the same sense that the prophetic forebears of Judaism were particularistic, Jesus was particularistic. He clearly comprehended that the Jews stood in a unique relationship to God. He directed His ministry to the Jews, admonishing them to faithfulness to the covenant relation to God -- calling them to higher righteousness and purer devotion. He sought to fulfill the Law and the prophets.

At the same time our Lord was universalistic. He perceived the love of God embracing the nations. He Himself expressed this love in His encounters with Gentiles. But more important He so defined the covenant obligation that Gentiles could accept it. He singularly emphasized that God's demand is spiritual -- righteous, merciful, humble character. Thus He universalized the Mosaic faith.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Abrahams, I., Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, 1st and 2nd series, Cambridge: The University Press, 1917, 1924.
- Albertz, M., Die Synoptischen Streitgespräche, Berlin: Trowitzsch and Son, 1921.
- Allen, W. C., St. Matthew (I.C.C.), New York: Scribner's, 1907.
- Arvedson, T., Das Mysterium Christi, Leipzig: A. Lorentz, 1937.
- Bacon, B. W., The Gospel of Mark, New Haven: Yale U. Press, 1925.
 , Is Mark a Roman Gospel?, Cambridge: Harvard, 1919.
 , Jesus the Son of God, New York: Henry Holt, 1931.
 , Studies in Matthew, New York: Henry Holt, 1930.
- Balmforth, H., The Gospel according to St. Luke, Cambridge: Clarendon Press, 1930.
- Bamberger, B. J., Proselytism in the Talmudic Period, Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1939.
- Baur, F. C., Paul, His Life and Work, 2 vols., Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1873.
- Bertholet, A., Die Stellung der Israeliten und der Juden zu den Fremden, Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1896.
- Bewer, J., The Literature of the Old Testament, revised edition, New York: Columbia U. Press, 1933.
- Blunt, A. W. F., St. Mark, revised edition, Oxford: Clarendon, 1929.
- Boussett, A., Die Religion des Judentums in Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter, 2nd ed., Berlin: Reuter und Reichard, 1906.
- Bousset, W., Kyrios Christos, Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1913.
- Bowman, J. W., The Intention of Jesus, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1943.
 , The Religion of Maturity, Nashville: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1948.
- Branscomb, B. H., Jesus and the Law of Moses, New York: R. Smith, Inc., 1930.
 , Mark (Moffatt), London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1937.
- Braude, W. G., Jewish Proselyting in the First Five Centuries of the Common Era, Providence: Brown U. Press, 1940.
- Browne, L. E., Early Judaism, Cambridge: University Press, 1920.

170

Budde, K., The Religion of Israel to the Exile, New York:
G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1899.

Bultmann, D. R., Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition,
Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1921.
, Jesus and the Word, trans. by Smith, New York:
Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.

Burkitt, F. C., Christian Beginnings, London: Macmillan, 1929.
, The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus,
London: Constable and Co., Ltd., 1922.
, Gospel History and Its Transmission, 2nd edition,
Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1907.

Cadbury, H. J., The Making of Luke-Acts, New York: MacMillan, 1927.

Campbell, J. Y., in The Expository Times, vol. 48.

Charles, R. H., Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament,
vol. 2, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

Clemen,

Clemen, C. C., Primitive Christianity and Its Non-Jewish Sources,
trans. by Nisbet, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark; 1912.

Cornill, C. H., Prophets of Israel, trans. by Corkan, Chicago:
Open Court Publishing Co., 1895.

Craig, C. T., The Beginning of Christianity, Nashville: Abingdon-
Cokesbury Press, 1943.

Creed, J. M., The Gospel according to St. Luke, London: Macmillan,
1930.

Cremer, H., Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek,
trans. by Urwin, Edinburgh; T. and T. Clark, 1878.

Dalman, G., Jesus-Jeshua, trans. by Levertoff, London: S.P.C.K.,
1929.
, The Words of Jesus, trans. by Kay, Edinburgh: T. and
T. Clark, 1902.

Danby, H., The Mishnah, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.

Davidson, A. B., Ezekiel, Cambridge: University Press, 1900.
, Old Testament Prophecy, Edinburgh: Clark, 1905.
, Theology of the Old Testament, Edinburgh: Clark,
1904.

Davies, W. D., Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, London: S.P.C.K., 1948.

Dibelius, M., From Tradition to Gospel, trans. by Woolf, New York:
Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935.
, Jesus, trans. by Hedrick and Filson, Philadelphia:
Westminster Press, 1949.

- Dodd, C. H., The Apostolic Preaching, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1936.
 , History and the Gospel, London: Nisbet, 1947.
 , The Parables of the Kingdom, London: Nisbet, 1946.
 , Romans (Moffatt), London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1932.
- Duncan, G. S., Galatians (Moffatt), London: Harper & Brothers, 1934.
 , Jesus, Son of Man, London: Nisbet, 1947.
- Easton, B. S., The Gospel according to St. Luke, New York: Charles Scribners Sons, 1926.
- Glover, T. R., Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire, 6th ed., London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1917.
- Goguel, M., Life of Jesus, trans. by Wyon, New York: MacMillan, 1933.
- Gould, E. P., St. Mark (I.C.C.), New York: Scribner's, 1903.
- Harnack, A., The Sayings of Jesus, trans. by Wilkinson, New York: Putnam's, 1908.
- Hebert, A. G., The Throne of David, London: Faber & Faber, 1941.
 , The Authority of the Old Testament, London: Faber, 1947.
- Holtzmann, H. J., Synoptiker, Freiburg: Mohr, 1892.
- Hoskyns, E., and Davey, N., The Riddle of the New Testament, London: Faber & Faber, 1931.
- Huck, A., Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien, Tübingen: Mohr, 1931.
- Hunter, A. M., The Gospel according to St. Mark, London: s.C.M. Press, 1948.
- Jackson, F., and Lake, K., The Beginnings of Christianity, 5 vols., London: Macmillan, 1920.
- Jülicher, A., An Introduction to the New Testament, trans. by Ward, London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1904.
- Kilpatrick, G. D., The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.
- Klostermann, E., Das Markus Evangelium, 4th ed., being vol. 3 of Handbuch zum Neuen Testaments, Tübingen: Mohr, 1950.
 , Matthäus (vol. 2 of Handbuch zum Neuen Testaments)
- Knight, G. A. F., From Moses to Paul, London: Lutterworth, 1949.
- Knox, W. L., St. Paul and the Church at Jerusalem, Cambridge: University Press, 1925.

- Lagrange, M. J., Évangile selon Saint Marc, Paris: Lecoffre, 1911.
- Loisy, A., The Birth of the Christian Religion, trans. by Jacks, London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1948.
 , Les Évangiles Synoptiques, Ceffonds: 1907-08.
- McFayden, J. E., The Message of Israel, London: James Clark, 1931.
- McNeile, A. H., The Gospel according to St. Matthew, London: Macmillan, 1915.
- Major, H. D. A., The Mission and Message of Jesus, New York: Dutton, 1946.
- Manson, T. W., "Jesus, Paul, and the Law," article in Judaism and Christianity, vol. 3, Law and Religion, edited by E. I. J. Rosenthal, London: Sheldon, 1938.
 , The Mission and Message of Jesus, New York: Dutton, 1946.
 , The Teaching Of Jesus, Cambridge: U. Press, 1948.
 , The Life of Jesus: A Survey of Available Materials: The Gospel of Mark (Reprint from Ryl. Bul., XXVIII, no. 1, 1944), The Work of Luke (Reprint from Ryl. Bul., XXVIII, no. 2, 1944), The Gospel according to St. Matthew (Reprint from Ryl. Bul., XXIX, no. 2, 1946), The Fourth Gospel (Reprint from Ryl. Bul., XXX, no. 2, 1947).
 , Ryl. Bul., XXIV, no. 1.
- Manson, W., Jesus the Messiah, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1948.
Luke (Moffatt), London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930.
- Montefiore, C. G., The Synoptic Gospels, 2 vols., London: Macmillan, 1909.
- Montgomery, J. A., The Samaritans, The Earliest Jewish Sect, Their History, Theology, and Literature, Philadelphia: John C. Winston, 1907.
- Moore, G. F., Judaism in the First Five Centuries of the Christian Era, 2 vols., Cambridge: Harvard Press, 1927.
- Moulton, W. J., "Parables," article in The Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.
- North, C. R., The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah, Oxford: U. Press, 1948.
- Oesterley, W. O. E., The Jewish Background of Christian Liturgy, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.
 , and Robinson, T. H., Hebrew Religion, Its Origin and Development, London: S.P.C.K., 1933.

- Otto, R., The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, trans. by Filson and Woolf, London: Lutterworth, 1938.
- Pedersen, J., Israel, London: Humphrey Milford, 1926.
- Rashdall, H., The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology, London: Macmillan, 1919.
- Rawlinson, A. E. J., St. Mark (Westminster), London: Methuen, 1925.
 , The New Testament Doctrine of Christ, London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., 1926.
- Robinson, T. H., Matthew (Moffatt), New York: Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1928.
- Schmidt, K. L., in Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, ed. by Kittel, vol. 1, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1933.
- Rowley, H. H., Israel's Mission to the World, London: S.C.M. Press, 1939.
 , The Missionary Message of the Old Testament, London: The Carey Press, 1944.
 , The Rediscovery of the Old Testament, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1946.
- Schurer, E. , A History of the Jewish People, revised ed., Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901.
- Smith, B. T. D., The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels, Cambridge: U. Press, 1937.
- Snaith, N., The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, London: Epworth Press, 1944.
- Stevens, G. B., The Theology of the New Testament, 2nd ed. Edinburgh: 1911.
- Streeter, B. H., The Four Gospels, A Study of Origins, Treating of the MS. Tradition, Sources, Authorship, and Dates, London: Macmillan, 1936.
 , The Primitive Church, London: Macmillan, 1929.
- Taylor, V., Behind the Third Gospel, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926.
 , The Formation of the Gospel Tradition, London: Macmillan 1933.
 , Jesus and His Sacrifice, London: Macmillan, 1937.
- Torrey, C. H., in Studies in the History of Religions (Presented to C. H. Toy), ed. by Lyon and Moore, New York; MacMillan, 1912.
- Volkmar, G., Die Evangelien oder Marcus und die Synopsis der Kanonischen und Ausserkanonischen Evangelien, Leipzig: Fues's Verlag, 1870.

- Warschauer, J., The Historical Life of Jesus, London: Unwin, 1927.
- Weiss, J., Das Älteste Evangelium, Gottingen: Vandenhoeck, 1903.
 , The History of Primitive Christianity, 2 vols., London: Macmillan, 1937.
 , Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1906.
- Weiszäcker, C., The Apostolic Age, 2 vols., Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate, 1894.
- Welch, A. C., Jeremiah, London: Humphrey Milford, 1928.
 , The Psalter, Oxford: U. Press, 1926.
- Wellhausen, J., Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien, 2nd ed., Berlins: G. Reimer, 1911.
 , Das Evangelium Marci, Berlin: G. Reimer, 1903.
 , Das Evangelium Lucae, Berlin: G. Reimer, 1904.
 , Das Evangelium Matthaei, Berlin: G. Reimer, 1901.
- Werner, M., Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Marcusevangelium, Giesen: A Töpelmann, 1923.
- Wiernik, P., in the Jewish Encyclopedia, ed. by Singer, article "Costume," New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1903.

